







# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

---

VOL. XLV.—OCTOBER, 1920—NO. 180

---

## THE INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY ACCORDING TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Is. lx., 1-5; 14-16. Col. i., 9-20.

TIME passes, flows rapidly like a stream, glides away like the clouds carried by the wind, and everything, under the powerful action of this master of the universe, changes, dissolves, vanishes, because it is the very characteristic of time to pass, as the history of every material being is summed up by dissolution and transformation.

The splendor of light, the grace of youth, the vigor of life, everything is subject to this law. The spring of this year shows us a phase of nature quite different from that of the past year; another generation of living beings comes out to enjoy the brilliant sunshine; a deep fatality pushes on every atom, molecule or living cell towards other forms and arrangements. For everything there is a place, for everything there is some work to do in the great up-building of centuries. Nothing, either in the physical or in the moral world, can escape the far-reaching control of the leading power of the universe, as they depend on it in their very nature and existence.

This movement, which is generally subject to the control of our intelligence in the physical world, escapes it in the moral world; the general notion of humanity under its specific laws, towards its specific end, which motion we call history, viewed by the natural eyes of our mind, is matter of conjecture as to its intimate laws and general issues. We walk on the edge of deep mysteries; we our-



selves are instruments carrying forward some mysterious action of the eternal power which dominates events.

But surrounded by the smiling seductions of nature, busy in the little incidents of our own daily life; nay, plunged so often in a stream of frivolities, we cannot be aware of the hidden action which supports and rules our own little actions as well as the great drama of mankind. It will be useful, therefore, to recall the principles which may renew in us the vision of universal history in the plan of God. At this fateful turning point of history, nothing could be more profitable than to lift up our eyes and consider once more what is everlasting under the turmoil of events. While the uproar of revolution is spreading over the world, and the disruption of alliances follows the most boastful declarations of peace and plans of a league of nations, we shall be struck on the one hand by the vanity of such designs, and on the other by the real foundations of all true progress based on the supernatural power inherited by mankind in the Church from our Lord Jesus Christ.

First of all we shall eliminate some interpretations of history based on mere natural reasons, and secondly we shall set down our principles according to divine revelation. Isaias and St. Paul, the most prominent teachers of this philosophy, will be our leaders.

We must suppose at the outset that as it is the whole of history which we wish to survey in its general principles, no one particular event of it can explain this whole, but something outside and above it. But at the very beginning we are confronted by a difficulty that threatens to overthrow the very foundations of our inquiry. Since universal history embraces the future as well as the past, how can it be possible at all to sketch its plan. The difficulty is more specious than real, for the plan of history is not history itself, and as we can conceive what a building is going to be even before the first stone is laid down, so the task of the philosopher of history is not first of all to put together all the facts, and then to discover their laws and mutual relations, but to draw the fundamental lines according to which history must shape itself. In such an inquiry the mere amount of historical data (whether drawn from what is now past or still to be learnt from what is yet to come) matters but little. All that is needed is that we should gain information enough to discover a path by which we may reach that central point from which all history is revealed to us in its general plan.

And in fact such information is to be found in the past of human history; it contains already all those elements which are and must be found in all times. It is as if you take and examine a seed in its embryonic stage; with a microscope you may easily trace in it the



shape of the future organism. Consequently the past, if examined in its true perspective, will form the base of our great historical construction. I said "in its true perspective," because there are certain interpretations of history based upon narrow or biased points of view.

Let us then briefly eliminate them in order to bring to light the only one corresponding to the real ways of Providence.

We suppose a man instructed in every form of philosophical, social and political science, but who has no suspicion of any revelation at all. With the light of such intellectual training, as he looks back on the past of humanity, he consults whatever monument may help him to get the most correct understanding of man's past. And thus by an accurate investigation of all available sources he is able to establish some connections, some periodical returns in history. But we can surely assert that he will never reach a satisfactory issue. By mere philosophical light he cannot grasp the eternal idea which lies at the real source of things and attracts history like a powerful magnet. Even granted that he might gather all the facts with their obvious, natural interpretation, that cannot be enough. All these facts are led in history, they do not lead history; they are stones in the building, they cannot exhibit the design of the architect, unless they are already disposed by him in this whole. Now that is not yet the case. The historian can never be sure that any particular event will tell him the idea of the eternal dominating power which is at the base of all natural energies in the universe.

As a matter of fact it would be for any philosopher of history an exceedingly difficult task to gather all the events, to connect them and give them their right interpretation. The difficulty becomes insuperable if we consider some further elements which escape all inquiry; deep influences of the physical upon the moral world; innumerable intermingling; connections in the universal solidarity of things and facts; above all the great riddle of human freedom. Considerations such as these prove impossible any foreshadowing of the future by the past on the base of its natural elements. While no genius is able to grasp and coördinate all the innumerable forces of the physical world which interfere in historical development, nobody, placed before the great mystery of human will, on which so many issues depend in social life, can follow the mysterious path of this singular power. As a matter of fact the problem must remain forever a sealed book to philosophy, because the leading factors of history are supernatural. If this be true, only the Master of the world can determine the laws of historical events. God alone, I say, as He has ordained already the final issue of all things and



knows how He leads by His universal power the development of all created activity, either necessary or free, is able to reveal to us the leading thread of historical evolution. Happily we possess this revelation.<sup>1</sup>

Now in the examination of its data, there are two ways open to us. We can start from the fact, which according to every point of view, supposing the general light of Christian faith, presents itself as the actual dominating factor in history: the Catholic Church. Here it is the task of the apologist to show both the internal and external qualities of this divine institution which proves to be the most sublime, comprehensive and universal. It answers to every human aspiration; it harmonizes all human activities both individual and social; it establishes the principles by which alone the true and satisfactory issue of the tremendous struggle for life can be attained; it resists any human opposition; it conquers the world by its invincible power and consistency. Therefore the Church is and must be, as a matter of fact, the pivot round which the sphere of events turns.

Now let us remark that this society which claims such an absolute universality is a human congregation, a social body. But such claim cannot be based upon human elements, otherwise we return to the insoluble difficulty proposed before. Consequently we must soar far

---

<sup>1</sup> That is directly against the principles of a philosophy of history exposed by J. Stuart Mill: "The state of the whole universe at any instant, we believe to be the consequences of its state at the previous instant; inso-much that one who knew all the agents which exist at the present moment, their collocation in space and all their properties, in other words, the laws of their agency could predict the whole subsequent history of the universe, at least unless some new volition of a power capable of controlling the universe would supervene."

Here answering in note to the objection drawn from the fact of human will he says that its "determinations" follow the causes called motives, according to as strict laws as those which "are supposed" to exist in the world of matter . . . a person's actions necessarily follow from his character; "that is to say" that he invariably does act in conformity to his character, and that any one who thoroughly knew his character would certainly predict how he would act in any supposable case. . . ."

Then he goes on in the text developing his idea: "And if any particular state of the entire universe could ever recur a second time, all subsequent states would return, too, and history would, like a circulating decimal of any figures, periodically repeat itself:

"Jam redit et virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna . . .  
alter erit tum Tiphys, et altera quae vehat Argo  
delectos heroas; erunt quoque altera bella (etiam altera bella)  
atque iterum ad Trojam magnus mittetur Achilles."

And though things do not really revolve in this eternal round, the whole series of events in the history of the universe, past and future, is not the less capable, in its own nature of being constructed "a priori" by any one who we can suppose acquainted with the original distribution of all natural agents, and with the whole of their properties, that is the laws of succession existing between them and their effects saving the far more than human powers of combination and calculation which would be required, even in one possessing the data, for the actual performance of the task.

("A System of Logic." Vol. I. 7th ed., London, 1868; chap. 5, p. 385-6.)



higher and recall what is divine and eternal in this society. The Church leads us to Christ; the Church is in a sense Christ Himself in his human body; the Church is the continued Incarnation of Christ, and by this link she attains the divine and eternal, embraces all time, overshadows the universe. It follows that Christ is the proper centre of history.

This is one way through which we can reach our conclusion; a perfect historical method, "*a posteriori*," which is necessary as a preparation for any further inquiry. But there is another way, far higher and nobler than the one just indicated. It is by approaching the design of God itself, by reading beforehand in the mysterious book of revelation the series of events with their causes. The succeeding empires, their rise and fall, confirm the prophetic word which rang through the valleys or under the walls of the cities of Palestine. Christ by his coming fully realizes the prophecies; St. Paul sums up for us all that revelation which concerns the universal conception of history. Let us sketch it by proposing the parallel between the Old and the New Testaments, so far as it concerns our question, drawing the chief lines of the picture.

There is no more familiar view arising from the deep insight of the prophets into the future than that of a kingdom which will last forever. The background is always the deliverance, development and growth of the temporal kingdom of Israel, which will pass through every trial, or after its fall rise again from its ruins, and at any rate survive the mightiest empires. But in the second part of *Isaiah*, in the *Psalms* and in the later *Prophets*, it shapes itself conspicuously into a universal kingdom of peace, morality and wisdom—quite spiritual, therefore,—under the immediate rule of the God of the world. This prophetic view is not expressed to us directly, but in terms of the history of the Jewish people during the three and a half centuries from the division of the Hebrew kingdom to the Babylonian exile. Through terrible crises, the little nation, which comes now into close touch with the great world powers, enters consciously the path of universal history, led by the gradual revelation of the *Prophets*. Behold, from the barren land and from the desert emerge the first great prophetic figures, whose vehement eloquence has the task of preventing the contamination of their beloved people. We see, therefore, that the immediate purpose of their teaching is a political as well as religious one. The most tragic changes of dynasties, the policy and religious reforms of the kings of Israel and Judah start from the word of prophets such as *Elijah*, *Eliseus*, *Amos*. The vision of *Jehovah* as the exclusive ruler of Israel has now altered; He has become once forever the ruler of all



nations. He will deliver the little kingdom or prevent its impending doom; He will overthrow the great empires, which are but tools in His hands. The majestic and always more or less tragic figures of the Prophets, who bear in themselves the most striking characteristics of their mission, like symbols of their message, while denouncing the crimes of Israel, or forecasting the judgments of the Eternal, rise to a sublime grandeur.

From the high perspective of their vision passes before us the history of Asshur, Babylon and Nineveh; the stream of tremendous invasions flows before their eyes and sinks beyond the horizon. Daniel, like a sculptor, carves the history of the great empires in a statue; the tumult of nations rises and passes before him. Rome extends its iron hands over all of them, and finally, after having prepared the cradle of the Deliverer in a little village of Judah—how strange that such a great empire had been established for such a little thing!—yields to his omnipotent power, and waits for the moment when she will become the Jerusalem of the new world; the veritable seat of the King of the universe, our Lord Jesus Christ. Dante expresses this very thought when he says that Rome had been built for the seat of the greatest Peter:

“La quale (Roma) e il quale (impero) a voler dir lo vero,  
fur stabiliti per lo loco santo  
u’ siede il successor del maggior Piero” (Inf. ii., 31-35).

“The which and what, wishing to speak the truth,  
were established as the holy place, wherein  
sits the successor of the greatest Peter.”

(Transl. Longfellow.)<sup>2</sup>

Isaías had seen all this in his grand visions when he uttered those memorable verses: “1. Arise, be enlightened, O Jerusalem; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is arisen upon thee. 2. For,

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Foster Kent in his valuable volume, “Kings and Prophets of Israel and Judah,” sums up in this way the prophetic vision of universal history: “The three centuries and a half, which began with the division of the Hebrew empire and extended to the Babylonian exile, were in many ways the most important period of Israel’s history. It was during this epoch that the Israelites ceased to be a provincial people, limited in their outlook to the narrow horizon of Palestine. (As a matter of fact it should be pointed out that they had been in close contact with Egypt, a world power.) Events over which they had little control brought them into close contact with the great world powers of the day, thereby vastly broadening their faith as well as their vision of history and of their relation to the human race. It was a period marked by supreme political, social and religious crises, which fundamentally transformed Israel’s religion and institutions. [We do not share, of course, this erroneous opinion with Dr. Kent.] These crises called forth the great ethical prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. and their work and teachings made Israel’s experiences during these trying years one of the most significant chapters in human history. These prophets were the conscience of their nation, its guides in the hour of peril, and the heralds of those great ethical and social principles which are the external foundations of law and society.” (Preface, p. v.).



behold, darkness shall cover the earth and a mist the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee and his glory shall be seen upon thee. 3. And the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, and kings in the brightness of thy rising. 4. Lift up thy eyes round about and see; all these are gathered together, they are come to thee. Thy sons shall come from afar and thy daughters shall rise up at thy side. 5. Then shalt thou see and abound, and thy heart shall wonder and be enlarged; when the multitude of the sea shall be converted to thee." . . .

"14. And the children of them that afflict thee shall come bowing down to thee and all that slandered thee shall worship the steps of thy feet and shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Sion of the Holy One of Israel. 15. Because thou wast forsaken and hated, and there was none that passed through thee, I will make thee to be an everlasting glory, a joy unto generation and generation. 16. And thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles; and thou shalt be nursed with the breasts of kings. And thou shalt know that I am the Lord thy Saviour, the mighty one of Jacob." (Is lx., 1-6; 14-17.)<sup>3</sup>

These outlines of the historical future as foreseen by the prophets agrees with the highest religious and moral teaching, and, accordingly, the future kingdom of God will be one of religious peace and prosperity (cf. Is. lv., 1-5; lxvi, 20-24; and *passim*). We cannot show the details of this plan in each prophet. Let us only remark that, as everything in this universe, the prophetic revelation also was progressive. Consequently it would be no serious objection to point out that there is lack of distinctness and great obscurities. There is on the contrary almost an excess of light as to their unmistakable relation to the future realities. Remember that the prophets were men of their own time, sent by God for the needs of their own time; hence, as the times were developing under the pressure of events, and the needs and aspirations of the people were widening, so the teaching and prophetic vision was opening accordingly.

"Yet I doubt not thru' the ages one increasing purpose runs,  
And the thoughts of man are widening with the process of the suns.  
(Tennyson—"Locksley Hall.")

Now Hebrew history was in its very reality, as well as in the parallel teaching of the prophets, the shadow of the future world; "*umbra futurorum*" (Col. ii., 17), as it is called by St. Paul, and so we must complete our sketch of the parallelism between the visions of the prophets and the far deeper insight of the inspired writers of the New Testament.

---

<sup>3</sup> cfr. Is. ii., 2-5; xxiv., 21-23; lv., 15; lvi., 20-24; the philosophy is outlined in the chapter xiii., 2-5; cf. xiv., 9-11; xxiii., 6-9; xxxvii., 26-29; I., 1 cf. and chap. xiv.



The Messianic world was at last a reality; the prophets had foreshadowed it; the writers of the New Testament reveal its very nature in its intimate and universal connections. But here, too, we must recognize some progress. The teaching of Jesus Christ on this subject as it is outlined in the parables differs very much from His teaching as it is stated by St. John. In both, however, we meet the same essential features of the kingdom of God, far wider and deeper than it had been shown by the prophets. Everything in the world, every moral power of mankind, will bow to the Cross, the sceptre of Christ. The Church under such a ruler will embrace all the nations of the world. It must break with the Synagogue once for all. The Hebrew race will scatter all over the world, as an eternal mark on the path of history; providential race, which from the "umbra futurorum" becomes, by way of contrast, lumen saeculorum. The main lines of the future organization of the new world empire are set down by Jesus Christ in the Apostolic College. The great institutions which will transform the human race and establish an eternal stream of life between heaven and earth, from the shadow of the figures and the prophecies, emerge to the light of perfect reality and receive the breath of the divine fecundity. Their application to the details of society will subsequently bring out more distinct features, but both the institutions and revelations close with the apostolic age. Hence, from this last stage we must draw the final shape of the world.

A glance at the teaching of St. Paul as the deepest and broadest view of the plan of God, will suffice for our purpose. The great Apostle of the Gentiles, in his sublime epistle to the Colossians, brings briefly together all the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. An Apostle chosen by God for the particular mission to strike the final blow at Judaism was the fittest of all to show the connections between the old and the new economy of the world in the plan of God. This is the passage in question, from the first chapter of the Epistle (Col. i., 9-20):

"9. . . we . . . from the day that we heard it, cease not to pray for you and to beg that you may be filled with the knowledge of His will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding. . . 12. Giving thanks to God the Father. . . 13. Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and has translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love. 14. In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins; 15, Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature. 16. For in Him were all things created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominations, or principalities, or powers. All things



were created by Him and in Him. 17. And He is before all; and by Him all things consist. 18. And He is the head of the body, the Church, who is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all things He may hold the primacy. 19. Because in Him, it hath well pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell. 20. And through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, making peace through the blood of His Cross, both as to the things that are on earth and the things that are in heaven."

These words which could be confirmed by parallel quotations from the other Epistles, and which are a further commentary on the sublime prologue of St. John's Gospel, if compared with the poems on the Servant of Jehovah, prove to be the most exhaustive formula of a truly philosophic interpretation of history. As chronology of all time, in the great majority of civilized peoples, centres in Christ, so only from Him comes the word which sheds the light on all progress and on all true civilization.

Do not object that in the passage quoted from the Apostle we have a mere theological speculation on supernatural subjects, and that therefore it is quite outside the pale of philosophy. Why? Because all philosophical reasoning on history must start from the reality of the actual elements, leading the human race to the final settlement, and not from a purely partial point of view; such as the economical, political or any other social standpoint. A history based on such grounds does not exist. In such a philosophy there may be some explanation of some series of phenomena; not of the whole of the destinies of actual humanity. If we reject the supernatural point of view as stated by revelation, and take no account of the deep spiritual current which permeates humanity, every system of interpretation must fail to reach its goal. Man who does not see it, has no eyes to see the splendor of the universe. Hence we do not agree with Fred. Schlegel, in eliminating the theological point of view from the problem. St. Irenæus, St. Augustine, Dante and Bossuet stand on a quite different basis; on the basis of Isaias' and St. Paul's teaching. How could we, for instance, separate from history the spiritual, but by no means unreal or uneffective influence of the priest, who stands on the path of Providence as the "dispensator mysteriorum Dei"? Consider only the great drama of the Mass, the powerful action of Confession. As in Christ and in the Church, in history also there are supernatural as well as natural elements. Everything in Christ, for Christ and through Christ; so, too, I do not hesitate to say, everything in the Church—though perhaps not always within its visible body—for the Church and through the Church; by these words everything is explained. As in Christ



all elements, even the most contradictory ones, are reconciled, so in the Church, so in history. Then everything is transformed in its deep and divine reality. From this vision of history we get an eternal standard of historical criticism. As Greek tragedy still grips our interest so powerfully on account of the intermingling of the divinity, so, but in a far higher way, the drama of mankind will fascinate the mind of the philosophic spectator of events.

Consider for a moment, how in Christ recognized as the centre of history, the darkest problems of life may be reconciled, and put in their true place when seen in their eternal significance. Sorrow becomes one of the most constructive elements of progress; work, the most crucial problem of modern times, becomes a combination of powerful and sound energies directed towards the creation of a more peaceful society than democracy can ever promise; evil itself is shown to be but the background upon which the power and wisdom of Providence is thrown into clear relief.

It is not on the ground of any dry philosophical principle that the living reality of history can be reconstructed, but on the basis of a personal being. Our knowledge depends on events, it is not their cause; therefore it may fail to grasp them thoroughly. Any real thing, any concrete reality supposes in its immediate background not an abstract idea, which in itself does not include any causal element, but a primitive power by which it sprang into being. This power is the power of God; but God, according to revelation, has made the universe in Christ, with Christ and through Christ, so that this Divine Person became, I might say, in the centre of the universe like a living formula summing up all reality, whether divine or human, the link connecting together the finite with the infinite. Christ, through Incarnation became visible to us; He entered the path of human history; but He came to dominate it, not to be a subordinate part of it. As a matter of fact He belonged to history before it came out in the light of creation, as He was the leading idea according to which God was going to shape the universe. And do not think that He, the Word, has behaved in a passive way in the creation and subsequently in the government of the world; not in the least, because He works as God Himself works, and also because His Person is the main point of attraction of all things, sharing with them through His human nature a part, at least, of their own nature, in the same time that He really lives in the eternity of God. These considerations must form an object of serious meditation for truly thinking men in order to regard history from a higher point of view, reducing its innumerable facts to the



unity of the divine plan, and so solving all apparent contradiction in the harmony of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

Let us conclude: Such an interpretation of history, as it enlightens the past, foreshadows the future, it widens the human intelligence, and is thus a great lesson to individuals and to society.

FULIRO CORDIGNANO, S. J.

Rome.

---

<sup>4</sup> Lightfoot in his exposition of the Epistle to the Colossians, makes this excellent remark: "The doctrine of the Person of Christ is here stated with greater precision and fullness than in any other of St. Paul's Epistles (p. 122). More especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews first and in the Gospel of St. John afterwards, the form of expression is identical with the statements of St. Paul. In both these writings the universe is said to have been created or to exist by and through Him (Christ). This is the crucial expression, which involves in itself all the higher conceptions of the Person of Christ (ibid., p. 123).

## CAPUCHIN MISSIONERS IN PALESTINE AND SYRIA.

**T**HAT out of evil cometh good may seem to be paradoxical, but it is an aphorism that has received confirmation in one of the results of the recent war of nations. The British conquest of Palestine, an historic event of the first importance, though not due to a revival of the Christian chivalry of the days of the Crusaders, redeems from utter sordidness a sanguinary conflict, largely motivated by racial and commercial rivalries. To rescue the Holy Land from the blighting dominion of Turkish rule was the unrealized day-dream and engrossing object of the distinguished Capuchin, Père Joseph du Tremblay, the *alter ego* of the great statesman and ecclesiastic, Cardinal Richelieu.

Among the orders that for centuries have been fostering the faith in the birthplace of Christianity, the Capuchin Order has borne no inconsiderable share. Father Clement of Terzorio, in the fifth volume of his work, "*Lei Missioni dei Minori Cappuccini*," details the results of the labors in Syria and Palestine of the religious brethren of "his Grey Eminence," the first organizer of the missions in the East and the Levant.

The first Capuchin to set foot in Syria and Palestine was Father Pacificus, of Provins, in 1622. He was the pioneer or precursor of two friars from the Provinces of Touraine and Brittany, Father Francis of Saumur, and Father Giles of Loches, who, after many troubles and dangers, reached Sydon or Saida—the oldest city and for a long time the capital of Phœnicia—and were well received by its ruler, Fakhr-el-din, a man of genius and ambition, who had restored it to its former importance as a great commercial centre. The missionaries, full of zeal for the salvation of souls, first went to convert the people about the court and used the chapel of the French consul, but shortly after had a small church of their own, subject to an annual tribute to the neighboring mosque. It was the mother-house of the whole mission.

It was an epoch when corsairs roamed the seas, over which for a time they exercised a dominion that no modern nation possesses, terrorizing Europe. Three of the friars sent to Egypt to found a mission there, were captured by Algerian pirates and made slaves. Others, designated for Persia, finding the way thereto barred by an armed movement of the Turks, established a hospice or residence in Aleppo, where they received a warm welcome not only from the French and Venetian consuls, but from all the French Catholics and heretics and even from some schismatical superiors, who visited



them; although the Jesuits and Calced Carmelites, who wished to gain a foothold there, had been maltreated. There were then in that city 160 or 200 poor Nestorian Christians, who for six years had returned to the Catholic faith, but were without a church, a pastor or one to speak to them of God or the sacraments. The Maronites were somewhat in the same condition, but had, however, a church and a married priest.<sup>1</sup> The latter, though he and his family worked all the day, could not pay the excessive tribute exacted by the Turkish governor, and he was, moreover, extremely deficient in Biblical and theological knowledge. The two Capuchins, who started the Aleppo mission, first lived in a shop, but, having acquired a small house, constructed a pretty chapel therein which was dedicated to Notre Dame des Lumières in 1627.

The Jews stirred up opposition, denouncing the Capuchins to a Turkish inspector from Mecca because they said Mass. "And why should they not celebrate it?" he replied. "Are they not priests like the others?" And when the Jews said the others—the chaplain of the Catholic consulates—had the "firman," or official permission of the Grand Vizier, which the friars had not, the Turk cut him short, saying that the Capuchins were fine people. He visited the mission residence, made a minute inspection of it, and, finding therein no provisions but a little rice, no furniture but some mattresses laid on tables or on the floor, no other clothes but the poor habit they wore, and hearing from an Armenian that they never received any money, was so edified that he went away, exclaiming: "By the holy God, these men are saints, real hermits! I will protect them in every place, I will be their friend!" Their calumniators, when the Grand Vizier came to Aleppo, sought to influence him adversely towards the Capuchins by the presentation of rich gifts, but, having heard their accusations, he replied that the Capuchins being recommended by the French ambassador, he could not believe they were spies from Spain. Through the intermediary of a renegade Frenchman who was barber to the Vizier, they obtained the necessary "firman" to enable them to remain undisturbed in Aleppo; whereupon the friars repaired to their chapel and chanted a "Te Deum." The Vizier, in addition, recommended them to the Cadi and other high officials; and they were granted a second "firman" permitting them to establish themselves in any part of his territory. Father Pacificus was able to write: "At present we live quietly; the house is founded *super firmam terram*; we celebrate Mass in our little church; we chant the Divine Offices and preach publicly, to the great joy and contentment

<sup>1</sup> The Maronites and Greeks are permitted to enter the married state before they take holy orders, not afterwards.

of every nation. And so the Lord God crowns the patient obedience of His servants."

Among the notable conversions they effected was that of the schismatical Armenian Archbishop of Orfa, Metropolitan of Aleppo, Monsignor Melchior, who, on May 25, 1627, wrote to Pope Urban VIII. a long letter in praise of Father Pacificus and his Capuchin brethren. On July 27, 1628, Louis XIII. wrote from the camp at Rochelle, ordering the French ambassadors and consuls to help and favor the Capuchin missionaries in the Levant and to prevent their being molested in their functions. This was very needful and helpful, as Olliver, the French consul at Aleppo, had thrown obstacles in the way of the Capuchins, whose missionary activities he did not favor. The mission, however, progressed daily. When, for the first time, the Holy Week ceremonies were held, they were frequented by everybody, and at Easter over four hundred Communion were administered in place of the three or four persons who had been present in the chapel in the previous years. In a communication to Propaganda in 1629 Father Chrysostom of Angers, wrote: "In Aleppo we are studying most assiduously the dialects, because the principal means, after prayer, to gather fruit and save souls is speech. We interrupt this study at times to get into touch with schismatics; and truly we find a great disposition among them for the Catholic faith, so that they seem to me to be outside the Church more through ignorance than malice, more materially than formally. Not knowing what to believe, they believe all that is taught them by their fathers; but we have hopes that they will readily believe the salutary doctrine of the most holy Roman Church. I believe that many of them are already without any error on this account and find themselves Catholics without knowing that they are converted. We also perceive among the Turks themselves marvelous dispositions; but this affair demands great prudence and secrecy, so as not to lose at one stroke all that is hoped for in time by wanting to gather it before it is ripe."

God also blessed their apostolic solicitude by the conversion of Fakhr-el-din, Emir or prince of the Druses, who, stricken with a serious illness in 1633, in the midst of his agony sent for Father Adrian of Brosse, from whom he received baptism and the names Louis Francis, directing his sons to follow his example. The conversion of a simple Turk is a crime punishable by death according to all Mohammedan laws; that of a prince by the most terrible reprisals. As soon as it became known, the Capuchins were arrested and sent to Constantinople, where they were threatened with death, if, abjuring the Christian faith, they did not at once embrace



that of Mahomet. They replied that in defense of their faith they were ready to suffer the most atrocious punishment. They were then thrown into a very dark, narrow, fetid prison cell, where they were so straitened for room that they could not have a moment's rest and were bastinadoed and deprived of water. Four died in prison in 1634, and one, liberated, died in Turin. The Emir some time after was beheaded and two of his sons strangled.

These events gave rise to the greatest disturbances. The other missioners were subjected to numerous vexations and persecutions. Father Sylvester, of St. Aignan, and Father Boniface, of Moulins on Mount Lebanon, were saved by a miracle. It is recorded that Turkish emissaries sought them everywhere, but never could find them. They were concealed in a cavern. One day the two religious having nothing to eat, and unable to go elsewhere on account of the great snow, an unknown man appeared to Father Sylvester, took him by the hand and led him to a neighboring village. When he returned the priest found in his cavern three hundred little loaves, sufficient for two or three months. The persecution continuing, they retired to Tripoli, helped by a Venetian merchant, and there founded, in 1633, a mission among the Greeks and Maronites who had been abandoned by their own priests. Gradually quiet was restored and the mission resumed its normal course, the Capuchins devoting themselves earnestly to the sacred ministry, not only among schismatics, but even among the Mussulmans themselves at the risk of their lives, converting the Grand Mufti of Aleppo and a Scherif; as well as pursuing their apostolate among Christians scattered through two hundred villages, the Druses, and among the Jezidi, who were neither Jews, Christians nor Turks, but who attended their lectures and particular exhortations, sermons, and Masses, as if they were Christians, though they had not the faith, begging the priests to lay hands on them and taking holy water to give it to the sick with a devotion almost incredible. When the missioners represented to them the blindness with which Mohammedanism had stricken them, they cursed the false prophet and lamented the difficulty of returning to the true faith, which was not only very dangerous to them, but to others, a fine of over 5,000 piastres being imposed for aiding in a conversion, two Capuchins and five merchants being imprisoned on that account. The Druses often begged the priests to celebrate Mass in their houses, that they might hear them more freely and receive their blessing. Their ignorance was so great that hardly two in every twenty knew the "Our Father" or "Hail Mary" in their mother tongue. There were whole villages where Mass was only said once a year, where not a

single one knew how to read, and where it was by a species of miracle they adhered to the Christian faith without any other help.

Most of the Syrian Christians were good people, but contaminated with the Eutychian heresy, propagated in Mesopotamia by James or Jacobus Bardanes, from whom they acquired the name of Jacobites. There were, here and there, 50,000 with a Patriarch at their head. Several were re-united to the Catholic Church by the Capuchins. Father Sylvester, of St. Aignan, a learned and saintly religious, effected the conversion of three Patriarchs: Ignatius, Simeon XXII., who got many of his flock to follow his example, and was obliged by the irritated sectarians to retire to Aleppo, where he died; a Greek Patriarch named Macarius, and an Armenian Patriarch called Khatchadur. For this the enraged sects, by means of bribing a Turkish Pasha, a hypocritical tyrant who masqueraded as Grand Vizier, had him imprisoned along with the two converted Patriarchs, Syrian and Armenian, for whose liberation he demanded 13,000 piastres. They had as fellow-prisoners two Capuchins accused of having built a church into which they admitted Maronites, although the friars protested that it had been built more than five hundred years before they came there. A Jesuit, Father Gilbert Rigault, wrote: "I am very much surprised at this event; I say, however, that it is very glorious for Father Sylvester, who speaks in his prison like the martyrs in their chains. Asked by the Pasha's *chiaia* if he had constructed a church, he replied that he did not, that Christians pray to God in every place, that the very prison which deprives the body of its freedom cannot deprive it of that of praying to their Master; that if they wanted to put him to death, because he prayed to God, he would receive death as a favor and would think himself happy in dying for such a holy motive. Father Sylvester has shown the courage of a martyr; and I beg you to ask of God for me to imitate such constancy, so necessary to all apostolic persons." As the Capuchins could not ransom themselves by the payment of a large sum—1,500 piastres having been demanded for the release of twelve Maronites, accused of having frequented the churches of the French missionaries—they were thrown into an iron dungeon with an iron chain round their necks and their feet firmly fastened to two beams.

At last, released through the intervention of the French consul, Father Sylvester went to Rome in 1658 and presented to the Pope, Alexander VII. the three Patriarchs' profession of the Catholic faith, and from thence to France to console the exiled Patriarchs, priests and Oriental Christians who had to leave their own countries; returning to the East in 1660 with 2,352 piastres collected for the



needs of the missions. He was called "the Father of the poor," whom he spent his whole life succoring spiritually and materially. He died in Aleppo on June 24, 1670, after forty years of missionary labors. The three convert Patriarchs, eight Bishops, sixty priests, and a weeping multitude of people attended his obsequies, the funeral oration being delivered by the Patriarch Andrea. The office was chanted in the Maronite church in five languages—Latin, Greek, Armenian, Syriac and Arabic. "In a word," records the archives, "there never were seen and never will be seen funeral ceremonies so beautiful and so honored in the Ottoman Empire." Another comments on the presence of so many nationalities, otherwise divided among themselves, as emphasizing the need of being united in the profession of the one faith under the one headship, that of the Roman Pontiff.

Father John Baptist, Father Sylvester's successor as superior of the Aleppo mission, continued, along with his religious brethren, to assist the Patriarch Andrea, who wrote to the Pope eulogizing the work of the Capuchins. That worthy prelate, who purged the Church of Aleppo of every error, died in 1676, when a heretical Patriarch named Abdel-Messieh intruded himself, in virtue of a firman purchased from Constantinople, and persecuted the missioners, handing over their converts to the Turks that they might be forced to return to the schism. The Capuchins acting in conjunction with the Jesuits brought about his deposition and the election in his stead of the Bishop of Jerusalem, Peter Gregory, who, as Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, had jurisdiction from Babylon to Egypt and the subject provinces in which he was confirmed by the Pope, who sent him the Pallium by Father Justinian, a Capuchin who printed in Rome a controversial work he had written in Arabic, Armenian and Latin.

As time went on, victories and defeats, triumphs over error and subjection to persecutions, prevarications and opposition from heretics and Mohammedans, conflicts with the civil power, with Turkish Governors and satraps, wars, pestilence, famine and earthquakes, crucial trials endured with heroic fortitude, even to bloodshed, assassinations and martyrdoms alternately marked the progress of the missions. Their history, as narrated by Father Clement, who has drawn his information from authentic archives, covers four centuries. It is a record of heroism, like the history of all Catholic missions in infidel countries or in savage lands, evidencing that the apostolic spirit of self-sacrifice lives and energizes wherever the Church sends its pioneers and propagandists.

Some incidents culled from Father Clement's voluminous record<sup>2</sup> will best illustrate this. Though Aleppo, the Lebanon and Antioch were the chief centres of missionary work, their activities extended over a large field, taking in Nicosia and Cyprus. When the Capuchins set foot in Nicosia the Church of St. James of Persia, martyr, with a house or hospice adjoining, were in possession of a wealthy Janissary, who entertained a deadly hatred of Christians. Through contempt of the Catholic religion he stabled his camels in the church. One night while he slept he had a terrible vision. He seemed to see a great personage, environed in light, holding a pastoral staff and clad in sacerdotal vestments, who in a threatening and angry manner said to him: "Perfidious infidel that thou art, thou hast had the audacity to make a stable for animals of my house! Know that if thou dost not at once remove them, I will cause thou and all thy family to perish! I give thee this warning, otherwise thou wilt receive the merited punishment of thy impiety!" At these words he awoke, terrified. He told the vision to his servants to get their opinions; but to show that he was courageous and not credulous like the common people, related it jestingly, and they had a great laugh together at the apparition. On the following night he had the same vision again, but more terrifying than the first, as the saint, besides the terrible threats he uttered, looked as if he would pierce him with his pastoral staff and give him his last blow, if at that moment he had not made reiterated protests of amendment and obedience. The saint added: "Since thou hast not taken any account of the warning I have given thee on the previous night and hast treated this vision as an ordinary dream, in order that thou mayest be persuaded to the contrary, I shall give thee evident proof of it by the sudden death of thy camels. Go and see them, and if the result corresponds to what I tell thee, learn from that the truth, and resolve either to perish with all that is dearest to thee in the world, or leave my church and the house where thou art, which from this moment I forbid thee to occupy." The Janissary awoke with a horrible shriek, perspiring and more dead than alive from fear. Suddenly summoning his domestics he ordered them to go into the stall to see what took place, and if his camels were alive or dead. Before going, the servants, to quiet him, assured him that they were very well and that only three hours ago they had given them their meal. But the Janissary, not satisfied with these assertions, exclaimed, excitedly, "Go and see, I tell you!" They went and to their great surprise, found them

---

<sup>2</sup> P. Clemente da Terzorio. *Defenitore Gen. ex-Segretario Gen. per le Missioni dei Min. Cappuccini. Le Missioni dei Minori Cappuccini. Stunto Storico*. Vol. V., *Turchia Asiatica*. Roma. Cooperativa Tipografica Manuzio, Via Piave. 1919.



dead. Confused and trembling, they returned to convey the news to their master, who saw by their dismayed appearance that the vision and the menace were too true. Stupefied, they told what they had seen; and, although there could not be the least doubt of the truth of what they said, they wished that he himself should be an eye-witness of it. A manifest sign was that he resolved to leave the place with all his family and abandon it, so that the threatened punishment might not fall upon him. The news of this miracle spread throughout the whole city of Nicosia, and was confirmed by the deposition of the Janissary, who affirmed it on oath, and by the sight of the dead camels, who were carried through the streets in presence of the whole people to be the prey of dogs and vultures. When the Janissary left it, no one would take the house, buy it or pull it down to build another out of its ruins; so that, seeing it abandoned and of no profit, the design was formed of selling it to the French consul to put religious into it, and convert it into a little convent. But the consul, unwilling to become the purchaser, it was sold to the Capuchins, who had long been desirous of establishing a mission in the island, particularly as it seemed manifest that God willed to be honored in His saint in that place. Such was the origin of the Capuchin convent and church in Nicosia, where they labored so zealously and successfully that the Church of St. James was frequented not only by Christians, but even by Turks, who begged from the religious a little oil for the lamp that was continually kept burning before the image of the saint to anoint their sick. Another mission was founded at Larnaca and the friars ministered to the poor Christian slaves in the Turkish galleys and converted some Lutherans and Calvinists, fettered along with Catholic prisoners and who abjured their heresy; many expiring in their arms in devout sentiments who otherwise would have died despairing and in sin without confession or the sacraments.

It was in Damascus there took place the most startling and tragic incident in the history of the Capuchin missions in the East. Long notorious as the most fanatically Mohammedan of all the cities in Asiatic Turkey, it appeals to the historic imagination on account of its great antiquity and its Biblical associations. Proudly proclaimed as one of the first cities built by the hands of man, it was already the capital of an independent State in the time of David and Solomon. The Prophet Isaías predicted that it would be destroyed. When it fell under the yoke of the Assyrians and Arabs they reduced it to a heap of ruins. Though once surrounded by a superb wall, it is now largely in a ruinous state. The most beautiful of its numerous mosques is the Zekia, a temple dedicated to St. John the Baptist,

built by the Emperor Heraclius. The history of the city up to the coming of the Arabs resembles that of the other Syrian cities successively conquered by Persians, Greeks, Romans and the Emperors of the East. Finally, after many vicissitudes, it fell in 1517, into the hands of the Turks, and remained under the Ottoman Empire until, during the great world war, it was occupied by British troops along with Jerusalem, Nazareth, Beyrout, etc.

The Mussulmans gave a new life to Damascus, which they regard as one of the holy cities of Islam, calling it "the perfume of Paradise." The pashalate, or pashalik, of Damascus is the most important of the five into which Syria is divided. The pasha of this city is distinguished from others and bears the title of Emir Hagi, or Prince of the Pilgrimage; he alone is commissioned to accompany the caravan of Mussulmans to Mecca, and is regarded as a sacred personality. Damascus is the place of departure, where assemble pilgrims from Syria, Asia Minor, Persia and Constantinople. The pilgrimage to Mecca lasts four months: forty days in going, forty in remaining, and another forty in returning. Before the expedition of Ibraim Pasha a traveler could not enter the city on horseback, and woe to him if he ventured to appear therein attired as a foreigner!

It was in 1637 the Capuchins penetrated into Damascus and settled in the Maronite quarter. Although they had to suffer many severe vexations, their ministry was largely blessed by God with glorious conversions, among their converts being the Greek Metropolitan, the Bishop of Tyre and Sidon (December 20, 1683), who, in a letter to Pope Innocent XI. makes mention of the exiles, imprisonment, contemptuous treatment and spoliation of the necessities of life to which he was subjected at the hands of Mohammedans at the instigation of some Greeks, their priests and their Patriarch, Cyril, for having professed the Roman Catholic religion. The Pontiff, in his reply (August 19, 1684), speaks of the great joy he derived from his letter and from what he heard from the lips of its bearer, the Capuchin, Father Accursius of Chateaunent, who had received him into the Church.

In the beginning of the last century the poor Christians in Damascus had much to suffer from greedy governors, a fanatical populace and insolent soldiery. The mission shared their fate, and if it was able to hold its ground it was through the exertions of two Italian friars, Father Francis of Ploaghe and Father Thomas of Calangiano. But the worst suffering was at the hands of the Jews, who put the latter to death under singular circumstances. A native of Calangiano, in the province of Gallura, in the island of Sardinia, he sailed on April 14, 1807, for



Damascus, where he spent thirty-three years of an active, zealous and fruitful missionary life. A resolute upholder of the Church and its ordinances, he would rather sacrifice his life than contravene them. A memorable instance of this was often related by the Observantines of the Holy Land, then in their Damascus convent, and who were eye-witnesses. A certain French traveler, whose lawful wife was living, wanted to marry another and used every means, but in vain, to gratify his capricious desires. He thought to put pressure upon Father Thomas to force him to accede to his wishes, and one day presented himself at the convent and with an arrogant and imperative air and with sophisms, subterfuges and threats sought to move him to join him in illicit matrimony. Finding the friar immovable in his resistance, he became furious, laid rough hands on him, and raised his sword to strike him. The priest threw himself on his knees, not to plead, but to protest, saying: "If you want to kill me for defending the ordinances of the Church, kill me, but I forgive you"; and, pointing to his neck, added: "Here is my neck—strike, do with me what you like; but know that God will not fail to make you pay dearly for your crime." The man who uttered those words had within him the spirit that makes martyrs; and it was a fate akin to martyrdom that awaited him in the sequel.

He went very much among the Jews, with whom he was very affable, trusting in Providence to be able to convert them. But he was to meet with no better fate at their hands than the Master, although he was in great repute among all the inhabitants of Damascus, particularly the Turks and Hebrews, visiting, consoling and curing the sick, distributing out of his little store as much alms to the poor as his poverty enabled him. Such was the esteem in which he was held by Turks of every class that in his regard they laid aside every prejudice or jealous exclusiveness, so that he was even accorded full liberty to visit and converse with their ladies in their private apartments, to which their nearest relatives were not allowed access.

Father Clement relates in detail, quoting his authorities, a case of ritual murder which reads like a page out of some mediæval chronicle, rather than a grave statement of fact, a well-attested incident of the nineteenth century. Prefacing his narration by alluding to the teaching of the Talmud, the disclosures of Sisto of Siena<sup>3</sup> and a converted rabbi,<sup>4</sup> and of alleged similar atrocities at Beyrout (1824), at Antioch (1826), at Tripoli (1834), at Rodi

---

<sup>3</sup> Sisto da Siena, *Hist. Santa*, p. 124. Paris, 1610. See also Gougenot Des Mousseau, *Les Juifs, le judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*. Cap. VI., *L'assassinat Talmudique*. Paris, 1869.

<sup>4</sup> Rohrbacher, T., 8 lib. 70., pp. 696.

(1840), at Der-el-Kamar in the Lebanon (1847), and, much later, at Smyrna, he states that a Damascus rabbi, Kakam Jacob Elantabi, a great observer of the Talmudic laws, at the approach of the Pasch, said to seven of the most hypocritical and venal that they needed human blood for the feast of the Azymes. The latter accepted the atrocious task and from religious or monetary motives, plotted a plan of carrying out the orders of the rabbi. The victim designated was Father Thomas, of Calangiano, who was wont to frequent their quarter to visit and care for their sick. His assassination was made known by his confrère, Father Francis, of Ploaghe, who, on March 5, 1840, wrote from Damascus: "On the day of February 4 the Jews apprized Father Thomas that the next day, which was the 5th of the said month, he was to go to the house of a Jew, near the dwelling of the Hebrew, David Harari, to vaccinate a boy. Without apprehending anything, he went to the house indicated an hour before sunset, and entered it, but did not vaccinate, because the boy was not in good health. From thence he was led to the house of David Harari, as it were, on invitation. He had hardly entered when they bound him, stuffed cotton into his mouth with a handkerchief tied tightly, so that he could not cry out. There were there the three brothers Harari, that is David, Aaron and Isaac, and their uncle, Joseph Harari, Joseph Legnado and Musa Solonichli. Then came the Rabbi Musa Abu, who said: 'This friar is too well known, he will be sought after, and evil will befall our nation.' They replied, 'Now it is done, we cannot let him go.' Then they summoned a Jewish barber called Soliman and said to him, 'Come and cut this friar's throat.' He excused himself by saying he had not the courage. Then David Harari took the knife, put Father Thomas on a mat and commenced to cut his throat; but his hand trembling, his brother Aaron came and finished the throat-cutting, the barber Soliman holding up the beard. The blood was collected in a large silver vessel, because it was to be used at the feast. When he was dead they stripped him of his habit and other garments, which were burned, and carried him into another room. There they began to cut him up in pieces; the big bones were pounded with an iron piston, and then the whole put into a coffin sack and thrown into a conduit of dirty water that went through the Jewish quarter. Those who cut him up in bits were the Jew barber, Soliman, and David Harari's servant, called Murad. The blood was put into a bottle and sent to Musa Abu."<sup>5</sup> With the habit burned, the flesh in fragments and the bones pounded, and the whole

<sup>5</sup> P. Francesco da Ploaghe. *Relazione dell' uccisione del P. Tommaso fatta dagli ebrei.* (Archives of the Capuchin Missions, Rome.) Busta: Siria, anno 1840.



thrown into the water,<sup>6</sup> the murderers hoped that their horrible crime would remain undiscovered. To endeavor to cover one crime with another, they decoyed the Capuchin's faithful servant, Ebraim Amarah, subjected him to the same fate and flung his dismembered mortal remains into a sewer.

On the morning of the murder when the people went to the convent for Mass, they found the church closed. Many had seen Father Thomas and Ebraim on the previous evening in the Jewish quarter; none had seen them return. The French Consul and the Turkish Scherif took steps to unravel the mystery of their disappearance. Domiciliary visits were made in the Ghetto. Two Greeks told how they had met there Father Thomas' servant looking for his master. Suspicion first fell upon the barber Soliman, who was arrested, bastinadoed, and made to divulge the names of those who had taken part in the homicide. The latter having been summoned and persisting in their denials, Soliman, on promise of pardon, detailed the whole diabolical plot and its execution. Though they first denounced the charge as "calumny," when the eight Hebrew accomplices were put on their trial they afterwards confessed everything. During the trial two of the assassins died, one became a Mussulman, three were released for giving evidence, and ten were sentenced to death. The sentence would have been immediately executed, but the French Consul, Count De Ratti Menton, had the whole proceedings sent to Ebrahim Pasha, generalissimo of the Egyptian troops in Syria, for his approval; and this respite sufficed to save the lives of the convicted Jews, because, in the interval, there arrived in Alexandria two delegates from the European Jews, Montefiore and Crémieux, who presented a petition to Mehemet Ali, from whom they asked a "firman" for the revision of the whole trial of the Damascus Jews and to make further investigations. When they presented themselves at the Divan, Mehemet Ali said to them: "You ask from me a reply to your note; and I tell you that the prisoners are free and the fugitives will return home, and larger protection will be given to your brethren; and I think that will be better than a revision and investigations, the more so, as nowadays the journey to Damascus is not safe, and the wish to reopen previous trials is the same as to stir up hatreds between Christians and Jews, while I seek to extinguish them. I shall signify my will to the consuls, and this very evening I shall send my orders to Scherif Pasha; and although I may be immersed in my grave occupations, notwithstanding that I shall not neglect your affair, because I love the Jews, they being submissive and indus-

---

<sup>6</sup> The Jewish quarter in Damascus is subterraneously channeled with an infinite number of conduits into which the refuse of the district is thrown.

trious. Therefore, I give with pleasure to their delegates this proof of sympathy."

As a result Mehemet Ali issued two "firmans," in virtue of which all the Jews who had been sentenced to death (September 5, 1840) were set at liberty and every one returned safe and sound to his own house. "So the assassins of Father Thomas and his faithful servant, Ebrahim, remained unpunished. Certainly," comments Father Clement, "neither our character nor personal sentiments permit us to call for blood for blood and proclaim a vendetta against a band of scoundrels; we only say that the decision was not just; pardon is granted for personal offenses, not for the assassination of others. For the rest, innocent blood speaks for itself, and such was that of Father Thomas', according to the confession of his very slayers. The French Consul having had occasion to speak of the homicide of Father Thomas directly with Mussa Abu Elafieh, said to him in Spanish, 'How, in your position, could you ever have deliberately consented to such an act towards a person so inoffensive as Father Thomas.' He replied: 'I myself cannot yet understand it, he was so good and did so much good.' Thus spoke the English Consul, John Barker: 'I have not the least doubt that the sacrifice of the Rev. Father Thomas will go down to posterity with the Massacre of the Innocents.'"

When they recovered from the conduit a portion of the remains of Father Thomas, they were first deposited in a tomb near the altar of St. Elias in the Capuchin church; the Turks, who attended the religious function, denouncing the perfidious Jews and bewailing the loss of Father Thomas, many of them on their knees venerating the bones of the murdered friar; while the lamentations of the Christians, not only Catholics, but schismatics and heretics, were indescribable. The sacrilegious outrage was universally condemned by the whole city of Damascus.

Monsignor Massimo, Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem for the Greek Catholics, sent, on April 6, 1840, a long account of the occurrence to Propaganda, in which he said: 'As this Father, while he lived, sought continually to inspire the spirit of charity and peace among all, after his death there is found in a particular manner union and love among all, Mohammedans, Greeks, Syrians, Armenians and Maronites who are all unanimously grieved over this deed.' He notes how some poor Mohammedans composed ballads in honor of the Capuchin which were sung in the streets; how it appeared manifest from their confessions that the Jews for thousands of years had been accustomed to commit these ritual murders; how antecedently many men had been missed from that



city and could not be traced until Providence had permitted that they should, through this misdeed, discover the reason; and how it was prayers to the Blessed Virgin that led to the discovery of the murder and of the remains of the victim, notwithstanding the scornful boast of a Jewess, the daughter of Nogius, the treasurer of Damascus, who said: "Yes; it was we who killed him, and we have thrown the body into Kalith; now if the Virgin can, let them make her find it."

Father Francis, of Ploaghe, put the following epitaph on the modest tomb, in which the body of Ebrahim was also subsequently deposited: "D. O. M. Here rest the bones of Father Thomas, of Sardinia, Capuchin Missioner, assassinated by Jews on the 5th day of February, of the year 1840." The remains were afterwards removed to Beyrout to place them in safety from the horrible massacre of Christians in Damascus on July 7, 1860.

A Roman painter, Constantino Giusti, out of gratitude for some services rendered him by Father Thomas, being in Damascus four years before the assassination, painted the portrait of the Capuchin friar, and, at the latter's request included in it that of his faithful servant, Ebrahim, faithful unto death. Two copies of it were made, one being sent by Father John Baptist, of Mondovi, to the King of Sardinia, and the other to the Most Rev. Father Eugene, of Rumilly, Minister General of the Order.

Father Thomas was not the only Capuchin who made the supreme sacrifice on the mission battlefield, where the forces of the Church militant were always in action, alternately combating and conquering or suffering temporary defeat, to rally again and fill up the gaps left in their ranks. During a rising in the Lebanon, in 1845, when the Druses and Maronites fought fiercely for two months, when thousands were slain and hundreds of villages were burned, Father Charles Andrew, of Loreto, a saintly man who, through humility, declined the office of Prefect Apostolic, was killed by the Druses, who had attacked the Christians. When they swooped down upon the Capuchin mission of Abey, Father Charles, either to save his life or to endeavor to quell the mob, went out from the convent, but at sixty paces from it was cut down from head to foot by a scimitar and then shot and burnt, his corpse in a few minutes being reduced to ashes. Father Ignatius, of Aleppo, a member of another religious order, who had taken refuge in the Capuchin convent, thinking he was safe there, was killed as soon as the Druses entered it. Some Maronites at night collected the ashes of the Capuchin missioner and buried them, along with the body of Father Ignatius, in the mission church.

Father Basil, of Novara, the founder of the mission in Antioch, was another victim. That city included in its population Turks, Jews and schismatics, all hostile to the Catholic religion. Though loved by many for his zeal, his agreeable manners and his gifts of mind and heart, the schismatical Greeks hated him, they could not abide the great and growing fruits of his apostolate; knowing that if he continued his mission there they would lose numbers and influence. They resolved to get rid of him and had recourse to the most efficacious means in Turkey—bribery. The schismatic Greek Patriarch of Damascus supplied the thirty pieces of silver for the betrayal; Omar Effendi, Governor of Antioch, was the Judas; the crucifiers, two Turks, pretended friends of the missionary. The plot was laid while Father Basil was in Alexandretta, at Easter. The schismatic Greeks, availing of his absence, went to the Governor, Omar Effendi, a fanatical Moslem, and said to him: "Effendi, there has resided in this city a foreign emissary, sent by the head of the Christians, who call themselves Catholics, the Pope, resident in Rome, the enemy of our religion. If you leave this man free, be certain that the Moslem religion, more than our Greek one, will suffer loss. It is a dishonor to you, Governor of this city, to let him live!" While the schismatic Greeks uttered these words, they dropped into Effendi's hands the purse with the thirty coins, which was more efficacious than words to permit everything and send them away contented. When Father Basil returned from Alexandretta, Omar Effendi summoned him to his presence and said to him: "Who has allowed you to turn your house into a church and pray there? Know that Antioch is a Moslem city!" To which the Father replied: "You have no right to address such observations to me, and in accordance with the mission with which I am entrusted, I can pray in any place." He then returned to the convent, where he continued his apostolate with still more ardor, and where he met his fate at the hands of his enemies. The Prefect of the Mission, Father John, of Termini, writing to Propaganda on June 5, 1851, says: "Finding myself in the Lebanon, visiting my brethren, the sad news reaches me of the assassination of the indefatigable, zealous and patient Capuchin missionary, Father Basil, of Novara, who for five years dwelt in the ancient capital of Syria, Antioch, the place of the primitive Christians. This son of St. Francis, the first missionary sent by His Holiness Pius IX., in the first year of his pontificate, went to trace the footsteps of the Apostles. With tears in his eyes he affectionately raised the scattered stones of that sacred, celebrated, antique altar which cost such labors to the Apostles in the persons of Peter, Paul and Barnabas, such blood to the European



Crusaders, and ultimately such sufferings to this zealous missionary. . . . Ten days before his death I received the last letter he sent me from Alexandretta, where he had gone to get the faithful there to fulfill the paschal precept. From thence he returned to Antioch, where, on the 12th of the past month, at broad noon, the poor Father was found in his little church, barbarously assassinated, with his head cut off.<sup>7</sup>

After celebrating Mass on the morning of May 12, 1851, Father Basil was approached by two Turks on the pretext of wishing to speak to him. One, who stood behind his shoulders, drew him somewhat backward, seizing him by the hands, while the other, who was in front, cut his throat with a cleaver. The victim, murmuring the names of Jesus and Mary, fell in a pool of blood. "The assassination consummated," says Father Giambattista, of Castrogiovanni, "the two Turks took the body of the new martyr and, by divine inspiration, unknown to them, deposited it in a worthy place—on the altar of the chapel! They covered it with a carpet and quietly retired, content with having gratified Mohammedan rancor with the murder of a minister of Christ. Shortly after there arrived at the convent the first pupils of the school, two sons of the Jew, Isaac Picciotto. Entering the courtyard they called the "abuma"; nobody answered. Finding the hall-door open, they went in and saw the floor inundated with blood, also the blood-stained altar, upon which they observed an unusual heap covered with a carpet; drawing near, they raised the edge of it, and what did they see? Their dear murdered master! Dismayed, they ran to tell the sad news to their parents. When the misdeed became known it fell like a thunderbolt on the whole city. Jews, Turks and Greeks (including perhaps the assassins) went to see the horrible spectacle! Omar Effendi, the Governor, whose office it was to take cognizance of the homicide, was the only one not seen there. What wonder! He was engaged in counting the thirty coins."<sup>8</sup>

Though the murder was committed in broad noonday, the authors of the assassination were able to remain concealed and unpunished. A long trial took place, but Omar Effendi and the others implicated were acquitted, as we learn from a record sent by the French Consul in Aleppo, E. De Lesseps, to the French ambassador in Constantinople; while their accusers, Hagi Mahomet Misserli and Behmez were declared the sole assassins of Father Basil, and were

---

<sup>7</sup> Archives of Propaganda, 1849-1854, Vol. XVII. "Scritture riferite nei Congressi." Siri.

<sup>8</sup> Unpublished manuscript, p. 349, in the Capuchin Missionary Archives, Rome.

imprisoned. Misserli declared that Effendi had promised him 500 piastres to murder the priest.

There being no cemetery for Latin Catholics in Antioch, Father Basil was buried in the Greek cemetery near the grotto of St. Peter, held in great veneration both by Catholics and schismatics and to which he often went to pray. This cemetery and grotto were afterwards purchased by order of Propaganda and are now the property of the Capuchin convent in Antioch. Twenty years afterwards, with a view of giving him more honorable sepulture, a marble tomb was made in Beyrout bearing the following inscription: "D. O. M. P. Basilius Novariensis. Ord. Min. Cap. Mis. Apostolicus, ob Zelum dilantandæ, Fidei Antiochia Missionem fundavit, ideoque ibidem Turcharum opera meridie cultre jugulatus est anno Domini MDCCCLI, ætatis suæ XLIII. iv idus Maii, exuviæ ejus his quiescunt." It was carried to Antioch; but the eye-witnesses of the interment were dead, no one could point out the exact spot where the remains had been deposited, and, notwithstanding careful excavations in the cemetery, the body could not be found, giving rise to the suspicion that the Turks and schismatics had made away with it secretly.

During the fanatical uprising of the Mohammedans in 1860 the Capuchin missionaries, in common with all the Christians in Syria, suffered greatly. Wild anarchy, accompanied with slaughter, sackings, rapine and burnings, was let loose and swept over the country like a whirlwind. Father Vincent, of Serravezza, was saved by a miracle at the burning of the Capuchin convent and church at Salima. At the approach of the ferocious hordes, he took the Blessed Sacrament, pyx and chalice, and in the midst of dense darkness at night made his way to Beyrout, which he reached at 8 o'clock in the morning, more dead than alive, passing by precipices and cliffs and the most dangerous places, keeping far from the villages of the Druses. This was one of very many episodes which thrilled the people with fright and horror. In a space of sixty leagues long and twenty broad everything was in ruin; five cities and three hundred and twenty villages were given to the flames by the Druses. Damascus, where six thousand houses were burned and great heaps of corpses were buried under piles of rubbish, was a large charnel-house. More than twenty five thousand victims were killed in two months.<sup>9</sup>

All Europe was moved; England alone said it was not so grave. France spoke loudly; its Bishops protested and the French Chamber urged the Government to take the initiative in armed intervention,

<sup>9</sup> *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, Vol. XXXII., pp. 401-402.



as the missioners and nuns massacred were mostly French and were under the protection of France. Lord Palmerton put forward the principle, which then prevailed, of non-intervention; the English papers asserting that the Maronites, at the instigation of France, were the slaughterers, and the Druses, the innocent victims of French policy and propagandism! This was said at a time when seventy-five thousand Christians, fleeing from their dwellings reduced to ashes, taking refuge on the coast or in the mountains, despoiled of every means of sustenance, were dying in large numbers of their wounds, from hunger, or from typhus or cholera. Among the victims were six thousand widows and ten thousand orphans. The Pope, the French Emperor and the Christians of Europe, headed by France, sent relief. All the religious houses existing were turned into hospices; the missioners stripping themselves of everything they possessed to succor the needy. Napoleon III. sent an expedition of 12,000 soldiers to Syria, but they were outnumbered by the enemy. The English Cabinet, although it had first approved of it, after six months insisted upon its recall. But Napoleon held firm. The armed intervention prevented the total extermination of the Christians, put an end to the massacres, subdued the ferocious Druses and compelled them to pay an indemnity to the Christians in compensation for houses burned and property destroyed. At the close of December there were still in Beyrout and its neighborhood not less than 30,000 homeless Christians, mostly fugitives from Damascus. Upon the death of Abdul Medjid and the election of the Sultan Abdul Azis, peace was restored. But the results of the war were not soon effaced. A Syrian, after a year's absence from Damascus and the Lebanon, was shocked on his return to see thousands of unburied corpses and, in place of inhabitants, serpents and birds of prey, and all around him the silence of death; no longer flocks and cultivated fields, no convents on the mountain tops nor bells to call the faithful to prayer, and, in place of houses, caves and caverns or cabins of rushes sheltering the unfortunate victims, attenuated by misery and hunger. Desolation was everywhere. The glory of Lebanon, the beauty of Carmel, the majesty of Thabor had vanished!

From the principal parishes in France were sent about eight hundred sacred ornaments for the churches, while the missioners devoted themselves to the work of restoration. The Capuchins were soon in possession of all their residences, except Damascus. At Beyrout, when the number of Catholics had increased, they built a new convent and church, restored the houses in Salima and Antioch, and vigorously pursued their apostolate on Mount Lebanon.

where they rescued from schism many strayed sheep who had wandered from the true fold, and inaugurated a mission among the Kurds at the entreaty of some leading men of that tribe, seven thousand of whom in 1869 were ready to receive baptism, their high priest declaring: "We are of Christian origin and we wish to become Christians again." Some tried to dissuade them from this perilous undertaking, saying they would be poisoned or otherwise killed, but, trusting in Providence, they set out, passing over the mountain of St. Simon Stylites, where the missionaries knelt at the remains of the column of the famous pillar-saint, invoking his intercession and blessing on their work. On the banks of the Euphrates they visited about eighty new Armenian Catholics, abandoned, without any priests to minister to them; other Catholics to the west of Aleppo being in the same spiritual destitution.

After the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, a calm followed the stormy times through which the Syrian missions had passed, the Ottoman Government relaxing its oppressive domination over its Christian subjects, while the animosity of the Greek schismatics against the Latins was mitigated. The Capuchins availed of this to open a large number of schools in the Lebanon to oppose Protestant propagandism and establish a college at Salima in 1882. In 1912 they had 117 schools with 5,685 pupils and five colleges with 385 students. Antioch, which suffered so much from a terrible earthquake that the missionaries, whose chapel and convent were destroyed, had to live in a little cabin, became an important centre of missionary activities. A movement towards Catholicism in the surrounding villages was manifest in 1889, but it met with much opposition from the Armenian heretics. However, in 1891, thirty families received baptism in the village of Koderbek, where the mission of Seleucia was founded under the protection of Mary Immaculate. This mission received a great impetus during the prefecture of Father Marcellino, of Vallarsa, who, in 1896, saved from massacre the whole population. In 1899 a new house, which cost the mission 40,000 lire, was acquired at Tarsus, and in the same year was reopened the convent of Abbey, where there is a Capuchin college with 45 intern and 200 extern students. In 1903 the Syrian Missions which, during the French Revolution,<sup>10</sup> had been placed under the juris-

<sup>10</sup> During the French Revolution the missionaries were temporarily under the protection of the Porte until peace was restored. When the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was decreed by the Constituent Assembly, the missionaries of the four religious orders represented in Aleppo refused, on principle, to join in a Mass of thanksgiving and "Te Deum," which would imply approval of a schismatical order of things condemned by the Holy See. For this they were denounced by the local Jacobites and their convents sacked. The Turkish Government imprisoned the republicans and seized upon their property. The Capuchins visited the French prisoners in the citadel of Aleppo and ministered to them, returning good for evil.



diction of the Italians, were re-entrusted to the French Fathers, of the Prince of Lyons, at the request of Father Bernard, of Andermott, Minister General of the Order.

Just when the missions were about to enter on a period of progress occurred the massacres of the Armenians in 1909. From the 14th to the 28th of April red ruin and desolation prevailed over nearly the whole mission field. When, on April 22, the Capuchins in Antioch heard that the little chapel of St. Peter in the old city had been sacked, one of them, Father Celestine, of Cotatay, went through the Armenian quarter, where a gruesome spectacle met his gaze, heaps of corpses infecting the atmosphere. The little church dedicated to the Prince of the Apostles, and where, hard by, is a fountain of limpid water held in great veneration by all Christians, was devastated and profaned by Mohammedan fanatics. The Capuchin residence at Koderbek was saved by the appearance of an English cruiser; but 150 men from that village, who were working in Antioch were all slain. Koderbek is in the midst of a region inhabited by seven thousand Armenians, mostly schismatics. Fifty of that persecuted race were massacred at Kirkhan in the Antioch region, the women and children finding refuge among the Carmelites at Baylan, a large Armenian village. Farther northward the Circassians sacked the environs of Akbes, where the Vincentians and Trappists have houses; but, fortunately, these missioners were not molested. The Capuchins at Tarsus were not so fortunate. In 1909 it contained 30,000 inhabitants, including 4,000 Armenian schismatics, 1,000 Greeks, 500 Catholics and the rest Mohammedans, or fellahs. There were four religious in the Capuchin convent. The mission had a school frequented by 130 pupils and a house of Sisters of the Holy Family to whom were confided 160 girls. When, on April 14, the guardian, Father Constance, of Pellissonne, heard that the massacre had begun at Adana, he went to the Kaimakan, who said: "They are false rumors, it is nothing serious. You are safe, I am ready to maintain order and protect you." Somewhat reassured, the missioners went to the Armenian quarter—separated from the Turkish quarter—where they found that the Armenians had been killed in their own houses. The next day two of the Capuchins returned to the Armenian quarter to tell them to go at once to the Capuchin convent. Many followed them, but the Kaimakan, who was in agreement with the Mussulmans, told them that they had nothing to fear. The poor people, in their simplicity, believed the hypocrite's words and returned to their homes; but they had only put foot on the threshold when 300 Mussulmans began to rush through the streets, crying out: "We have finished with Adana,

let us do the same with Tarsus!" The Capuchins went back to the Seraglio; but the Kaimakan's reply was always the same: "Make your minds easy and quiet the people; above all, don't receive any one into your house.." The superior's answer was: "We shall receive all that come." They had already two or three hundred. The situation became worse when it was falsely rumored by the Turks that 1,500 Armenians from Adana were going to kill the Mussulmans, the falsehood being deliberately spread through all the surrounding villages. The brutalized Afghans, like madmen, battered in the doors of the powder magazine, obtained possession of weapons and, reinforced by Bashibazouks, traversed the city and, passing before the Capuchin convent, cried out: "The Armenians are within, we see them; let us begin here." Two of the friars heard one of them remark: "It is the French school, let us leave them alone," and another reply: "It is full of Armenians who have brought with them money, let us begin with them." But they made their way to the Armenian quarter first, intending to return. One of the Capuchins ran to the Seraglio. The streets were full of Turks armed to the teeth; but he went on boldly. "What do you mean by speaking like this, Excellency?" he said, to the Governor. "Twice you have said to us that there was nothing to be feared, that you would answer for order, and now they are killing the Christians! You are responsible; dread the vengeance of God!" The Governor stammered: "I can do nothing. I am powerless and distracted." The missionary then obtained from the Governor two soldiers to accompany him on his return. Passing through the Turkish bazaars he met a Moslem sheik with a green banner in one hand and an axe in the other, calling out: "In the name and for the love of Mahomet kill the Christians: if you don't you'll not enjoy Paradise." At such a sight the intrepid missionary went back to the Seraglio and saw the Kaimakan again. "You say you are powerless," he said, "and cannot you then have the sheik, who exclaims, 'Death to the Christians!' arrested?" The Kaimakan, to satisfy him, had the sheik arrested, at least provisionally. From all sides was heard continual firing, each shot meaning a victim. Christians of all rites, Catholics or dissenters, repaired to the Capuchin convent; Catholic, Armenian, Maronite, Greek and Syrian clergy being received as guests. They thronged from all places to the Capuchins. Poor mothers hurried thither with their children; for the least delay might cost them their lives. The religious of the Holy Family, heedless of danger and self-forgetful, attended to these unfortunate people. A French flag was improvised and upraised. The two soldiers, thinking it would draw fire upon the convent, were taking



to flight, but were held back. Father Constance, the guardian, and another friar remained day and night on guard at the door, knowing well that little trust could be placed in the soldiers, unless continually watched. Meanwhile the firing increased and incendiaries were at work. The Capuchins, at great risk, left the convent and secured a reinforcement of a dozen soldiers. It was providential, for, on their arrival, a band of Bashibazouks was before the convent, crying out: "Let us set fire to it! The Christians are inside!" Some of the latter had carried into the convent old guns wherewith to defend themselves, but the guardian strictly ordered them not to fire and prudently made them give up their arms; for one shot fired would mean the death of everybody. All prayed together fervently in the chapel, although most of the refugees were schismatics. At the approach of danger the Armenians fled into the orange gardens: about a hundred were surprised and slain. A fugitive Armenian was leading with him his two sons, when he met a Turk. "Give me your children," the latter said, "I will take care of them, and you can more easily escape." But at that very moment the unfortunate man was massacred before the eyes of those two innocent creatures. When the pillaging and sacking of the houses of the poor Christians ended, the burning began, spraying the doors with petroleum and then setting fire to them. But that not being quick enough, they got the fire engine filled with petroleum and pumped it on the burning building. The whole city was soon a prey to the flames and resembled an immense brazier. Enormous clouds of smoke, black and reddish, rising upwards, flames ending in crackling sparks, human cries mingling with detonations, walls falling with a crash, shadowy minarets silhouetted against this lugubrious background, presented a spectacle at once grandiose and horrible. The fire continued all night; by the morning it had devoured everything: six hundred houses were only smoking ruins, four thousand Armenians had not a roof to cover them.

A Capuchin missionary who was an eye-witness of all these sad scenes wrote: "What nights our refugees spent! All prepared for death; Catholics and schismatics besieged the confessional. Weariness or fear did not disturb us. Some days afterwards, on the evening of Tuesday the 27th, on the resumption of the massacres and burnings at Adana, we were greatly alarmed. Not venturing to enter into this establishment, where hundreds of Armenians were protected by the French flag, they thought of setting fire to it. They began by pouring a bottle of petroleum over the front, covering the liquid with straw, and, saying they did so to prevent the bad smell, applied the fire. The sight of the flames enabled us

to intervene in time. Everything was to be feared at that moment; but presently things became quiet when the deposition of Abdul-Hamid, of which we learned during the night, was announced. The military commandant, an avowed Young Turk, came the day afterwards with fifty soldiers to reassure us: he spoke to the refugees and promised them that they would be no longer molested. To say that they took his word for it would be saying too much. However we breathed freely; the incubus of keeping vigil was removed."<sup>11</sup> The number of victims in the whole Tarsus region was 553.

Father Constance, after visiting the Armenian quarter, wrote: "It is impossible to recognize this quarter which I have so often traversed, now incumbered with stones, tables, windows, half-burned garments and calcimined beams—desolation the most complete, the uttermost ruin. The presbytery and little Armenian-Catholic school were a prey to the flames, but the roofless walls of the new church are intact. The sacristy, transformed into a provisional chapel, was, however, saved from the fire, but the bandits forced the doors and sacked everything. The demolished tabernacle lay on the ground, the smashed baptismal font and basin in the middle of the chapel, the books scattered here and there, and the sanctuary lamp broken in fragments scattered over the pavement. A few paces from there is the schismatical Armenian church, the finest in all Tarsus. The efforts of the incendiaries were powerless against this stone-built edifice, but it was pillaged, and presented the same spectacle, but in a greater degree, as the Catholic church. The lamps, books and remains of the windows lay on the ground; the Bishop's throne had disappeared, and in its place nothing was seen but a heap of ashes; the large pictures defaced by sabre slashes or broken by kicking—everything in these churches or private houses was dispersed, given to the flames or fell into the hands of the pillagers."<sup>12</sup>

For such misdeeds there was no real redress, no one responsible was made to answer. The outbursts in Adana (April 14) had their repercussion in Mersina on the same day.<sup>13</sup> The population there, composed of 4,000 Greeks, 1,000 Armenians, 1,000 Latin Christians or Catholics, and 15,000 Moslems, had good reason to fear on account of the numerical preponderance of the last named. It was known that bands of Circassians and Fellahs were roaming around Mersina, ready for the extermination of the Christians and for incendiarism, acting in concert with the Moslems in the city. There were two Capuchin missionaries helped by three Marist lay brothers

<sup>11</sup> "Antioch and Tarsus, Massacres and Missioners." Beyrout, 1910, p. 37.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

<sup>13</sup> Mersina is two hours' train journey from Adana.



and ten nuns of the Sisterhood of St. Joseph of the Apparition; while the Capuchin convent harbored more than a thousand refugees. The energetic action of the Mutasserif, or Governor, saved the city; all the inhabitants of Mersina paid this honorable testimony to him. But he was suddenly removed. Finally, on the night of the 21st a German battleship arrived and signalled its presence by a cannon shot; the same day it was joined by the French cruiser Victor Hugo; and then came English, Austrian, German, Russian and American cruisers. From that moment Mersina was considered safe, and all the refugees in the Capuchin convent went back to their own houses. But refugees from elsewhere, from Adana, Tarsus and the interior, fleeing from death, began to arrive in groups, knocking at the door of the Capuchins, where they were received with great hospitality. For three months the Mersina residence or convent was at the services of three thousand refugees whom the Capuchins succored, fed and clothed and saved from death. In the four northern convents of the Syrian missions, Antioch, Tarsus, Mersina and Koderbek, thousands during the days of the massacres and hundreds in the succeeding months found refuge. The Capuchins gained the esteem and good will of the whole population, and effected so much good that it might be chronicled as one of the most fruitful years of their missionary apostolate.

When tranquillity was restored the mission resumed its ordinary course. "That part of the East," concludes Father Clement, of Terzorio, "the birthplace of humanity and religion, tenaciously preserves the traditions of ages; in those regions schools from which prayer, the idea of God, religion and Christian morals is banished, cannot exist. The Orient is believing; true, it wrestles with doubt, then arrives at religious indifference; allured by the desire of becoming rich, it often and easily neglects religious duties; it passes betimes from one religious sect to another; but at the bottom of its heart it preserves the faith; it does not deny the sublime dogmas of God the Creator and Saviour, or the fall of man, the immortality of the soul, and a future life, happy or unhappy, beyond the tomb. And on occasions of illness and other mishaps, they have, before aught else, recourse to God, to the missionary, and make their confessions. It is a very rare thing for an Eastern Christian to die an atheist, and there is no instance of it. One may be steeped in ignorance or corruption of heart, but in the acute crises of life his faith awakens, his hope in the goodness and mercy of God assumes the form of pardon."<sup>14</sup>

For centuries Capuchin missioners in the Near East have been

---

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 479.

laboring zealously and successfully, despite all obstacles and opposition, for the glory of God, the triumph and extension of the Church, and the salvation of souls. "God, in whose hands is the future of peoples," says Father Clement, "continues to diffuse His divine graces over that land of Patriarchs, Prophets, holy fathers and doctors, in which were accomplished the great mysteries of our common redemption, and fosters in our missionaries the spirit of abnegation whereby they are enabled to continue with ever-increasing alacrity their difficult apostolate and bring back to the Fold of Christ the lost sheep."<sup>15</sup>

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

---

<sup>15</sup> Op. cit., p. 480.



## ST. PAUL AND CHRISTIANITY.

ST. PAUL, whose mission it was to loose Christianity from the cerements of Judaism and to inspire the pagan world with joy and hope, has a perennial interest and charm for the modern mind. Amid the intensive research and instructive investigations of philological experts in the field of that religious and philosophic syncretism which prevailed in the Græco-Roman world between 300 B. C. and 300 A. D., his epistles are continually the focus of fascinating questions. No other section of the New Testament seems to stimulate so many strange and often contradictory theories. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Bauer and the followers of the Tübingen school, basing their historico-exegetical method on the postulates of Hegelian evolutionism, accepted only the great controversial epistles of St. Paul as authentic. The remainder of his writings were looked upon as "tendential" documents whose purpose was to conceal the division in the Apostolic Church. Sane and sober critics, however, with the exception of a number of Dutch scholars, represented especially by Van Manen,<sup>1</sup> regard most of the Pauline epistles as truly the works of the great apostle. Hence we may once more consider these as conveying to us a true picture of Christianity in the beginnings of its history, and not as documents mostly of the second century, in which the conditions of that age were transferred to the century preceding it. So too, all that we read in them concerning Our Lord, His Person and His life, comes to us certified and warranted by one of His own generation.<sup>2</sup>

But though the epistles of St. Paul have issued triumphantly from the test and scrutiny of the most acute theologians of the last century, a result which may be considered as one of the greatest gains which scholarship as applied to the New Testament has won for the world, yet somehow or other advanced criticism cannot leave St. Paul alone. It no longer emphasizes questions of authenticity, but the primary question now at issue is the essential nature and the sources of St. Paul's doctrinal system. Especially does there seem to be a feverish desire to disassociate Christ from Christianity and to lay upon St. Paul the responsibility of transforming the original

<sup>1</sup> "Encyclopædia Biblica." Art. "Paul"; Vol. III., pp. 3603-3637. (Adam and Charles Black: London, 1902.)

<sup>2</sup> A return to the traditional standpoint in regard to problems of authenticity was thus prophesied by Professor Harnack: "Es wird eine Zeit kommen, und sie ist schon im Anzug, in der man sich um die Entzifferung litterar historischer Probleme auf dem Gebiet des Urchristentums wenig mehr kümmern wird, weil das, was überhaupt hier auszumachen ist, zu allgemeiner Anerkennung gelangt sein wird, nämlich das wesentliche Recht der Tradition."—*Chronologie der altchristlicher Litteratur*. (J. Hinrichs' sohe Buchhandlung: Leipzig, 1897.) pp. 10-11.

Jewish, prophetic and eschatological gospel message into a universalistic gospel of redemption, Greek in form and content. With the recent critics it is an incontestable axiom that St. Paul was the second founder of Christianity and the creator of a theological system. His inventive genius is exaggerated beyond all limits, and the distance separating him from Christ is deliberately emphasized. But the more the critics stress the originality of his doctrine, the more difficult it becomes to explain it solely according to the laws of natural evolution. Looking upon Christianity as a huge plagiarism, they seek its roots in Alexandrian Hellenism, Palestinian Rabbinism, Mathraism and in the Chaldean and Babylonian myths. The motive underlying the transformation assumed to have taken place in the character of Christianity as it was preached by St. Paul is said to have been the task which fell upon him of making his religion acceptable to the pagan world around him. Of late, however, the critics are beginning to be shocked at their own extravagant claims, and shifting their position they seem to repudiate their very basic principles, and blame St. Paul for every antipathy to modern thought in traditional Christianity. Hence the cry, "zurück zu Jesus," which has been resounding among German theologians is inspired by the ulterior motive "los von Paulus." Our Lord, they say, preached but one dogma, the Fatherhood of God, and inculcated but one precept, brotherly love. In view of these aberrations of modern criticism it is fitting that we should inquire into the fundamental relation between St. Paul and his Master. For the apostle has been accepted on only one condition, namely, that he speak as a faithful disciple of Our Lord, and that his teaching has been received on no other supposition than that it reproduces faithfully the mind of Christ. Accordingly, out of this problem there arise certain questions regarding St. Paul's relation to the formation of Christian teaching, and we shall group our discussions under the following three headings: I. How far was St. Paul acquainted with the historical Jesus? II. What was the relation of his teaching to that of Christ and of the early Church? III. The specific contributions of the apostle to the development of Christian doctrine.

I. In regard to the first question, it is maintained by the principal followers of the Tübingen school that the apostle had but a vague knowledge of the historical Christ. They base their contention on the following misinterpreted text: "Wherefore henceforth, we know no man according to the flesh. And if we have known Christ according to the flesh; but now we know him so no longer."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> II. Cor. v. 16. St. Thomas thus paraphrases this passage: "Ante conversionem meam opinabor Christum tantum esse hominem . . . ; nunc credo quod sit verus Deus." Cfr. also xii., 18-22; Phil. iii. 3-8.



If any one will look at the context for a minute, however, he will see that St. Paul is here speaking of his own ministry and of certain people who had condemned it. Far from wishing to be judged by appearances, he desires to be considered not as what he seems to be, but as one who is a new creature in Christ. He himself, he says, has left off judging according to the flesh. There was a time before his conversion when he knew only a fleshly Messiah, a national deliverer, the object of material hopes, the warrior king of an earthly Sion. But his conversion has changed all that: "but now we know him so no longer." Now he knew a Christ whose love for him constrained him, in whom God was reconciling the world to Himself. Hence the distinction noted in the text is not between the historical and the glorified Christ, but between the Messiah, such as the unbelieving Judaizers represented Him, and the Messiah as He manifested Himself in His death and resurrection. St. Paul expresses elsewhere the same contrast when writing to the Corinthians: "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the Gentiles foolishness. But unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men."<sup>4</sup> To have seen the Lord Jesus with the eyes was in itself nothing to boast of. Herod had seen Him, and Annas, and Pilate, and many a Jewish merchant, and many a Roman soldier. But to have seen Him with the eyes of faith, to have spiritually apprehended the glorified Redeemer—that was indeed a privilege which belongs only to a Christian. And this is true of any one else who is in Christ. He must be judged not in accordance with earthly manifestations, but according to his spiritual nature.

By some, however, the above text is understood to mean that St. Paul had seen Our Lord during His earthly life. Both Ramsey and J. Weiss<sup>5</sup> maintain that "Paul knew Jesus in the vision on the road near Damascus, because he had seen Jesus in life and recognized the man whom he had known." The question seems at first sight to be answered affirmatively in his first epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul asks: "Am not I an apostle? Have not I seen Christ Jesus our Lord?"<sup>6</sup> But here St. Paul cannot possibly be alluding to any knowledge of Jesus before His crucifixion, for he certainly cannot found any argument on this acquaintance in favor of his

---

<sup>4</sup> I. Cor. i., 23-25.

<sup>5</sup> W. Ramsey: "The Teaching of Paul," pp. 21-30 (Hodder & Stoughton: New York, 1914). "The Expositor," May, 1901, pp. 356-360. J. Weiss: "Paul and Jesus," pp. 16, 29, 31, 40 (Harper: New York, 1909.)

<sup>6</sup> I. Cor. ix., 1.

apostolate, for such a meeting would have taken place while he still disbelieved in Him. It can only apply to the appearance of Christ to him on the way to Damascus or to some subsequent revelation.<sup>7</sup> Indeed the question, "Who art Thou, Lord?"<sup>8</sup> in his conversion, seems distinctly to imply that the personal appearance of the Lord was unknown to him. In fact it seems inconceivable that Saul could have seen Jesus in His lifetime. If Our Saviour's personal ascendancy awed even His most bitter enemies, and troubled the callous conscience of His Roman judge, if one glance from His eyes of infinite sorrow caused hot tears to gush from Peter's eyes, how much more heart-rending would similar reminiscences be to one who so pathetically complained that he persecuted the Church of God. Had he been in Jerusalem when Our Lord came there for the last Pasch, had he been present at the scenes in the Sanhedrin and the Prætorium, he surely would have violently opposed Jesus, and his voice would have mingled with the tumultuous outbursts of "Crucify Him!" Would he not, in view of his intense impressibility, have afterwards continually reproached himself for having thus persecuted his beloved Master? Had he been present at the sacrifice on Golgotha, to which he afterwards looked as the most momentous event in the whole of history, would there be no allusions to it to be detected in his writings? The question naturally arises: Where, then, was he at this time? He may have been at Tarsus, which after his conversion he regarded as his home.<sup>9</sup> He was about twenty years old when the Galilean ministry of Our Lord began. His studies at Jerusalem were now over, and he had left Gamaliel's home, and probably because of his poor health went to his native city of Tarsus. When he returned later to the Holy City, where his married sister was also living, he eagerly joined the discussions about the Crucified One, began fiercely to persecute "the Way," and was finally conquered himself by the Master. Still another explanation of his absence from Jerusalem may be found in his epistle to the Galatians,<sup>10</sup> where he represents himself as having once been a preacher of the circumcision. One of the special characteristics of Pharisaism was an active zeal in winning proselytes, as is evident from Our Lord's solemn warning: "Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because you go round about the sea and the land to make one a proselyte."<sup>11</sup> Now we know from St. Paul's epistles how impetuous was his zeal and how restless his desire of doing good

<sup>7</sup> Acts xviii., 9; xxii., 18; II. Cor. xii., 1.

<sup>8</sup> Acts ix., 5; xxii., 8; xxvi., 15.

<sup>9</sup> Acts ix., 30; xi., 25; Gal. i., 21.

<sup>10</sup> Gal. v., 11.

<sup>11</sup> Matt. xxiii., 15; Acts ii., 10; vi., 5; xiii., 43.



during his missionary career among the Gentiles. His conversion, while it changed his earliest and most fundamental convictions, only gave a new direction but did not destroy his impulsive temperament which must have worked in him also when he was a preacher of Judaism. Hence, during the brief visits of Our Lord to Jerusalem in the course of His ministry on earth, Saul may have been absent on some journey enjoined upon him by his party.

Thirdly, some critics understand our text<sup>12</sup> to mean that St. Paul had but a scant knowledge of the life and teaching of the historical Christ, and that he even disdained and disparaged such knowledge as inferior and useless. The apostle's interest, they say, was only in the Divine Christ. Yet, while it is true that Jesus as the Messiah was the central point of his teaching, and that the details of the earthly life were for him transcended in importance and in vividness by the realities and activities of the risen Lord, it is equally true that he knew of this Divine Christ only through His manifestation on earth. On the road to Damascus, in response to Saul's query: "Who art Thou, Lord?" the answer came: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest." Had our Lord uttered those vast, bright and lofty titles that were His by right, Saul would well have answered that this is not the Crucified One whom he was persecuting. But that he might know that he is persecuting Him who was made flesh, took the form of a servant, died, and was buried and rose from the dead, Our Lord tells him: "I am Jesus of Nazareth." And regarding this Jesus of Nazareth, St. Paul, as we shall now proceed to show, testifies to almost every single primarily important fact, such as His Incarnation, Life, Suffering, Betrayal, Last Supper, Trial, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension and heavenly Exaltation.

That St. Paul was well acquainted with Our Lord's Incarnation and earthly life we have sufficient evidence in his epistles. Writing to the Corinthians, he tells them that Jesus is a man: "For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead";<sup>13</sup> that "if by the offense of one many died, much more the grace of God, and the gift by the grace of one man, Jesus Christ abounded unto many."<sup>14</sup> And again: "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and of sin, hath condemned sin in the flesh."<sup>15</sup> The Messiah was born, as true man and subject to the Law, in the "fulness of time."<sup>16</sup> He was "made of woman"—a phrase which probably indicates the miraculous and Virgin Birth of Christ, for

---

<sup>12</sup> II. Cor. v., 16.

<sup>13</sup> I Cor. xv., 21.

<sup>14</sup> Rom. v., 15.

<sup>15</sup> Rom. viii., 3.

<sup>16</sup> Gal. iv., 4; Jn. I., 14; Phil. ii., 7; Lk. ii. 21, 27.

while it is true that all the apostle says is that He was born of a woman, yet notwithstanding the importance which as a Jew he attached to it, he says nothing of male generation. Our Lord, we are further told, was a Jew, a son of Abraham; for enumerating the prerogatives of the Israelites, St. Paul singles out above all the fact that of them is "Christ according to the flesh."<sup>17</sup> The same Christ was a descendant of David. It was the apostle's mission to proclaim the "laetum nuntium" "concerning His Son, who was made to him of the seed of David."<sup>18</sup> The apostle also knows of the "brethren" of the Lord, who were His cousins or the children of Joseph from a former marriage, and that one of these was called James.<sup>19</sup>

Our Lord's manifestation to the world is not in a manner consistent with His nature, rights and exalted titles, but He appears as a servant of all. The apostle, writing to the Church of Corinth, tells them that the churches of Macedonia, afflicted as they were, yet with a spontaneous liberality and affectionate enthusiasm for his wishes subscribed large amounts for the collection of saints; so too the Corinthians, abounding in so many gifts and graces should abound in this; he would not order them, but only asks a proof of their love even as Christ had set the example of enriching others by his own poverty: "for you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, he became poor for our sakes; that through his poverty you might be rich."<sup>20</sup> While the reference in this passage is not specifically to Our Lord's poverty in material things, but to the poorness of His earthly life as compared with His heavenly glory, yet the context to the passage shows that most probably the poverty of the life of Jesus helped to complete the picture of His self-denial. The same idea seems to be implied in the well-known passage of the Epistle to the Philippians.<sup>21</sup> In striving to urge upon these the example of humility and unselfishness as the only possible basis of unity, St. Paul sets before them the Divine lowliness which had descended step by step into the very abyss of degradation, yes, even to death on the cross. The Saviour was of a meek and gentle disposition—St. Paul beseeches the Corinthians, through the "mildness and modesty of Christ" not to despise his apostolic authority. He came to preach peace to the Gentiles "that were afar off, and peace to them that were nigh."<sup>22</sup> He chose from among His disciples twelve apostles, several of whom are mentioned

<sup>17</sup> Rom. ix., 5; iv., 1; Gal. iii., 16; Mt. i., 1-16.

<sup>18</sup> Rom. i., 3; I. Cor. x., 18; Jn., i., 14; Mt. i., 1.

<sup>19</sup> Gal. i., 19; I. Cor. ix., 5; Mt. xii., 46.

<sup>20</sup> II. Cor. 8., 9; II. Cor. 6., 10; Mt. xx., 28.

<sup>21</sup> Phil. ii. 6-9; II. Cor. iv., 4; viii., 9; Heb. ii., 17; v., 8; xii., 2; Mt. xx., 28; xxvi., 39; Jn. i., 1; v., 18; x., 18; xiv., 28.

<sup>22</sup> Eph. ii., 17; ii., 14; Acts ii., 39; x., 36.



by name, who were to continue His ministry; among these St. Peter occupies a position of pre-eminence.<sup>23</sup> He limited His ministry to Israel, and did not go outside the confines of Palestine, for no other purpose than to fulfill the promises given to His people: "for I say that Jesus Christ was minister of the circumcision for the truth of God to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."<sup>24</sup> He taught that we should bear one another's burdens,<sup>25</sup> and is an adequate subject for imitation by men.<sup>26</sup> Our Lord's miraculous activity is not mentioned directly by St. Paul, but His miracles are presupposed when the apostle speaks of the "signa Apostolorum" accomplished in His name. Besides, we must remember that the working of miracles had not the same significance to one of St. Paul's age and surroundings as to a modern.

When we come to the institution of the Eucharist we find that the apostle gives us a minute and detailed account, one which would well fit into the synoptic scene, and which testifies that the author was well capable of writing as a historian. The house of Chloe had broken to him the news that the Church assemblies and Sunday services had become noisy and disorderly. Even the Agapæ lost their traditional purpose in connection with the Eucharist. The deadly leaven of selfishness, greediness, egotism and drunkenness, insinuated itself into these once simple and charitable gatherings. The simple narrative of the institution and object of the Lord's Supper, and the solemn warning which attended its profanation, is meant to serve as a remedy against these gross disorders. The Lord's Supper is traced for us in all its dramatic beauty: It was the same night in which He was betrayed, Jesus takes bread, blesses and breaks it; in like manner after he had supped, He takes the chalice: he pronounces the sacramental words over both species, adding each time the recommendation which should perpetuate the mystery.<sup>27</sup> It is worthy of note in this connection that the reference to the Lord's Supper was called forth by certain disorders in the Church at Corinth. Had no such occasion existed, the epistles of St. Paul might have been altogether silent about the Eucharist, and then the critics would certainly hasten to assure us that St. Paul knew nothing about it.

The allusions to the death of Our Saviour are very numerous, being called forth by their dogmatic value. The apostle tells us that Our Lord took His repast with the disciples on "the same night

---

<sup>23</sup> Gal. ii., 7; I. Cor. i., 12; ix., 5; xv., 5.

<sup>24</sup> Rom. xv., 8; Mt. xv., 24.

<sup>25</sup> Gal. vi., 2.

<sup>26</sup> I. Cor., xl., 1; iv., 16.

<sup>27</sup> I. Cor. xi., 23-24; Mt. xxvi., 26-28; Mk. xlv., 22-24; Lk., xxii., 17-20.

on which he was betrayed.”<sup>28</sup> These words contain “in nuce” a large part of the history of the Passion. The reference to the “night” implies a chronological knowledge of the events, and the word “betrayed” points to information concerning the traitor and the arrest. St. Paul also knows of the outrages and invectives with which Jesus was overwhelmed: “For Christ did not please Himself, but as it is written: ‘The reproaches of them that reproacheth Thee fell upon Me.’”<sup>29</sup> In him, he says, the sufferings of Christ abound,<sup>30</sup> nay, he was mulcted of all things to know the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death.<sup>31</sup> In fact, is there not an allusion to the abandonment of Christ and to His prayer on the Cross in the description which the apostle gives of his own desertion at the moment of death? “At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me; may it not be laid to their charge. But the Lord stood by me and strengthened me—and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.”<sup>32</sup> The Saviour out of love<sup>33</sup> died voluntarily for us, having been fastened with nails<sup>34</sup> to a wooden<sup>35</sup> cross<sup>36</sup> and afterwards buried.<sup>37</sup> The Crucifixion took place at the time of the feast of the Passover<sup>38</sup> under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate<sup>39</sup> and the Jews were responsible for the death of their Lord.<sup>40</sup>

So, too, the Resurrection of Our Lord is strongly attested in St. Paul’s epistles, especially in that immortal chapter<sup>41</sup> to the Corinthians in which he confirms their faith in this doctrine, and removes their difficulties respecting it. If they would not nullify their acceptance of the gospel in which they stood and by which they were saved, they must hold fast the truths which he again declares to them, namely, “that Christ died for our sins. . . . and that he rose again the third day<sup>42</sup> according to the Scriptures.”<sup>43</sup> He enumerates the Saviour’s appearances to Cephas, to the twelve, to more than five hundred at once, of whom the majority were still

---

<sup>28</sup> I. Cor. xi., 23.

<sup>29</sup> Rom. xv., 3.

<sup>30</sup> II. Cor. i., 5; iv., 10; Col. i., 24.

<sup>31</sup> Phil. iil., 10.

<sup>32</sup> II. Tim. iv., 16, 17.

<sup>33</sup> Gal. ii., 20; i., 4.

<sup>34</sup> Col. ii., 14.

<sup>35</sup> Gal. iil., 13; Acts v., 30.

<sup>36</sup> Rom. vi., 6; Gal. ii., 20; vi., 14.

<sup>37</sup> I. Cor. xv., 4.

<sup>38</sup> I. Cor. v., 7.

<sup>39</sup> I. Tim. vi., 13.

<sup>40</sup> I. Thess. ii., 15.

<sup>41</sup> Chapter xv.

<sup>42</sup> Does not this incidental statement that Christ rose on the third day imply a knowledge of the fact recorded in the Gospels and of the empty tomb?

<sup>43</sup> xv., 3-4.



living, to James, to all the apostles and lastly to him, as "one born out of due time." That St. Paul had taken much trouble to obtain sound evidence of the fact of the Resurrection is clear from his emphatic statement: "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."<sup>44</sup> The day of resurrection seems to have a religious significance for St. Paul, for on that day he establishes the weekly offertory for the saints at Jerusalem. Finally, we are also told that Our Lord ascended "above all the heavens"<sup>45</sup> and that He sits on the right hand of God,<sup>46</sup> whence He will come to judge the living and the dead.<sup>47</sup>

Besides these testimonies which can be adduced from St. Paul's epistles to show that the apostle's knowledge of the historical Christ is all that could be desired, it is necessary to state in addition a few general considerations. In the first place, the critics lay too much stress on the argument from silence. Confident assertions and inferences based on silence are dangerous. Thus, for example, the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine epistles is undoubted. Now in the Gospel, St. John gives us an account of the human life of Christ, shows interest in it, in fact there seems to be internal evidence in his Gospel that he was acquainted with the synoptic account.<sup>48</sup> But if we examine the epistles we find in them a characterization of Christ even more transcendental than in St. Paul, and scarcely a single reference to the human life of Jesus.<sup>49</sup> If we had no Fourth Gospel, could any one conclude from the silence of the epistle that the author was ignorant of the gospel story? Or again, if we argue that St. Paul was ignorant of the gospel narrative because of his scanty references to the earthly ministry of Christ, what is to be said of the Epistle of James or of the Petrine Epistles, Christian literature which according to critical authority is of later date than the Pauline Epistles and whose authors were familiar with the gospel story? Yet we find in them less reference to the earthly life of Jesus than in St. Paul's epistles. And to expand this argument from silence still further, what is to be said of John the Baptist, whose mission is attested by secular history? St. Paul must have heard of that mission even before he heard of Jesus, and as a zealous Jew he must have been keenly interested therein,<sup>50</sup> but in his epistles he nowhere mentions the great precursor. Similarly, although he was a Roman citizen, he makes no allusion to events of contemporary Roman history.

---

<sup>44</sup> xv., 14.

<sup>45</sup> Eph. iv., 8-10.

<sup>46</sup> Rom. viii., 34; Eph. i., 20.

<sup>47</sup> I. Thess. i., 10; iv., 6; Phil. iii., 20.

<sup>48</sup> Jn., i., 26, 27, 32, 33; vi., 68; xii., 27.

<sup>49</sup> I. John iv., 2.

<sup>50</sup> Acts xiii., 24.

Again, St. Paul's epistles everywhere presuppose what is known as the apostolic catechesis, an oral instruction which the apostles imparted to the neophytes before or after baptism.<sup>51</sup> Hence the apostle knew more than he tells us in his epistles, and what he omits formed part of the essential elements of his preaching. It is omitted not because it is unimportant, but on the contrary because it is fundamental. Instruction about it had to be given from the very beginning, and did not often have to be repeated. St. Paul was a missionary before he was a theologian, and preached the Gospel in places where neither Jesus nor the Messiah had ever been heard of. All this early historical instruction about the life of Christ necessarily therefore belonged to a period of St. Paul's life antecedent to that which gave rise to his epistles. If his writings therefore do not contain many allusions to the Gospel narrative, they nevertheless assume in their believing readers a previous and fairly detailed knowledge of the history of Jesus. We have ample evidence in the Pauline epistles to show that in the primitive Church such a preliminary oral instruction was given to the catechumens.<sup>52</sup> Thus when writing to the Thessalonians, St. Paul admonishes them not to be stationary, but to advance more and more in that Christian cause which he had marked out for them. "We pray and beseech you in the Lord Jesus, that as you have received from us, how you ought to walk, and to please God, so also you would walk, that you may abound the more."<sup>53</sup> He exhorts them to "stand fast and hold the traditions" which they had received from his words and his genuine letter.<sup>54</sup> They are to have no intercourse with all those who were "walking disorderly and not according to the tradition which they have received from us."<sup>55</sup> So, too, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, in trying to dispel their doubts and anxieties on the subject of the resurrection of the dead, he recalls to them his oral preaching: "I make known to you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also you have received and wherein you stand; by which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain."<sup>56</sup> But not only does the apostle allude to his own preliminary oral instruction, but he makes us understand in his epistles that there were catechists who either voluntarily or officially instructed the

---

<sup>51</sup> Mt. xxviii., 19; Mk. xvi., 15.

<sup>52</sup> Lk. i., 4; Acts xviii., 25; I. Cor. iv., 17; Rom. vi., 17; Heb. vi., 12.

<sup>53</sup> I. Thess. iv., 1; Eph. iv., 1.

<sup>54</sup> II. Thess. ii., 15; I. Cor. xi., 2.

<sup>55</sup> II. Thess. iii., 6.

<sup>56</sup> I. Cor. xv., 1-11.



neophytes: "And let him that is instructed in the word, communicate to him that instructeth him, in all good things."<sup>57</sup>

Thirdly, St. Paul must have known of Our Lord already before his conversion. He was in intimate relations with the leaders of the Sanhedrin who contrived and brought about the death of Jesus. Being a man of alert and keen intelligence, he would not take it for granted that an obscure visitor to the feast was suddenly seized and crucified because of some indiscreet utterances, but he would diligently inquire concerning the events that led up to the crucifixion. Probably he was one of those who had disputed with Stephen, on whose face he saw the expression of such heavenly enthusiasm and serene hope as the Mosaic law could never inspire. And during his fierce persecutions of the Christians he must have continually heard from them some reminiscences of the Saviour. Who was he who had worked so many miracles during his ministry in Galilee, and who had caused so much commotion and excitement among the people? Who was He who had inspired the simple fishermen and ignorant publicans with a wisdom unattainable by a Hillel or a Gamaliel? Who could it be to whom his followers turned their last gaze and uttered their last prayer, and who seemed to breathe upon them from the parted heavens a peace that surpassed the understanding? Who was this whom they declared had risen from the dead and whose body certainly had vanished from the rock-hewn sepulchre in which it had been laid? These and similar questions must have haunted Saul in his unswerving determination to persecute and root out the Church of God.

Again, St. Paul was a man of commanding genius, of keen and alert human interest, and of an emotional temperament.<sup>58</sup> He was

<sup>57</sup> Gal. vi., 6. Cfr. Zahn: "Einleitung in das neue Testament; pp. 171-172 (A. Deichert: Leipzig, 1907).

<sup>58</sup> St. Chrysostom finds in St. Paul's Epistles: "Isocratis tersum levorem, Demosthenis amplam sublimitatem, Thucydidis verendam majestatem, Platonis excellentem dignitatem" (lib. 4, De Sacerdotio). And again: "Cor Pauli coelis ipsis sublimius, orbe latius, radiis solaribus splendidius, igne ferventius, adamante solidius, fluvios emittens et rigans, non terrae superficiei, sed animas hominum." (Hom. 32, in epist. ad Rom.)

And Bossuet pronounces the following panegyric on the great Apostle: "Il ira, cet ignorant dans l'art de bien dire, avec cette locution rude, avec cette phrase qui sent l'étranger il ira en cette Grece polie, la mere de philosophes et des orateurs; et malgre la resistance du monde, il y etablira plus d'églises, que Platon n'y a gagne de disciples par, cette eloquence qu'on a crue divine. Il prechera Jesus, dans Athenes, et le plus savant de ses senateurs passera de l'areopage en l'école de ce barbare. Il poussera encore plus loin ses conquetes, il abbatera aux pieds du Sauveur la majeste des faiseux romains en le personne d'un proconsul, et il fera trembler dans leurs tribunaux les juges devant lesquels on le cite. Rome meme entendra sa voix, et un jour cette ville maitresse se tiendra bien plus honoree d'une lettre du style de Paul adressee a ses citoyens, que de tant de fameuses harangues qu'elle a entendues de son Ciceron." (Panegyric. de s. Paul.) Ad loc. cit. Van Steenkiste "S. Pauli Epistolae." Vol. I, pp. 19-20 (Burns and Oates: London, 1899).

a man of marked characteristics, of an intense individuality, and marvelous intellectual power. He was trained in the technicalities and methods of Jewish theological learning. He had sat as a "disciple of the wise" at the feet of the most eminent of the rabbis, and had been selected as an inquisitional agent of the Sanhedrin because he surpassed his contemporaries in burning zeal for the traditions of the schools. He was intensely interested in all that concerned his people and his own religion. Hence it is hard to believe that such a man was ignorant of anything concerning Jesus, and His life on earth. For is it impossible that during his double sojourn at Damascus he would not question the faithful concerning the mortal life of his Master? That he had learned and retained nothing of his conversations at Antioch and at Jerusalem with the prince of the apostles, with the beloved disciple, with James, Barnabas and Silas, and with the other members of the nascent Church? That he passed so many years with the future historians of Jesus. St. Mark and St. Luke, without having heard of the miracles and discourses of the great Wonder-Worker whose preaching had revolutionized the world? It is inconceivable that St. Paul would take no interest in the life of Him for whom he was willing to suffer the loss of all things and count them as dung. The claim that a crucified Jew was to be obeyed as Lord and trusted as Master must surely have provoked the question as to what kind of a man Jesus was.

Finally we must be careful not to regard St. Paul's epistles as deliberate treatises and systematic expositions of Christian theology. We must not consider them as something studied and literary. St. Paul's epistles were simply letters, not personal, but pastoral, written on a specific occasion and to a particular body of his converts. They were suggestions in regard to local difficulties or arrangements, or words of counsel, encouragement, and consolation. They were subsidiary to the ordinary teaching, and he does not dwell in them on anything which is not a matter of difficulty or controversy. Hence they were not called forth by an inward purpose or necessity on the part of the apostle to formulate his thought, but each of them in response to particular conditions in the community to which it was addressed; and the contents and its form is often due to the apostle's intensely vivid realization of the situation to which he is addressing himself. Thus the epistles to the Thessalonians were principally evoked by the necessity on the part of St. Paul to quiet the apprehensions of his converts in regard to certain points of his eschatological teaching. Again, the question of legal observances, though settled by the compromise at Jerusalem and by the triumph of St.



Paul's principles at Antioch, continued for a long time to harass the primitive Church. The apostle in solving the difficulties arising out of the problem left us the four great epistles. At the same time there arose in the Church certain theological and practical doubts on different points of the catechesis. The first epistle to the Corinthians gives us an idea of the many cases of conscience which the apostle was called upon to solve. Soon after this the purity of the Gospel began to be threatened by coming into contact with profane science, philosophy, and oriental theosophy. The Person and mission of Christ now became the main issue. In his epistles of the captivity, St. Paul answers and satisfies the questions of his converts, and explains the role of Christ in the order of salvation. Finally, fully aware that he had "finished his course" and that the "time of his dissolution was at hand," St. Paul began to feel the need of organizing his churches and guarding them against false and strange doctrines. Hence in the pastorals his main concern is to solidify the government of the Church and to exhort his followers to "guard the deposit."

II. Having gathered up the passing allusions and brief indications found scattered throughout St. Paul's epistles, and having corroborated them by some general considerations, we find that the apostle's knowledge of the historical Christ was more definite and more substantial than could at first sight be imagined. We come now to the second question, namely, the relation of the teaching of the Epistles to that of the Gospels. In the latter, we are told, we find a simple narrative, in the former a scheme of theology. How was it possible, it is asked, for St. Paul or any one having only the former to go upon to develop the latter out of it. In fact it is held that the distinction between the Gospel of Our Lord and the Gospel of St. Paul is so fundamental that the apostle may in truth be called the second founder of Christianity. Before we discuss the apparent divergences on which this contention is based we shall first show by a careful study that the relation of St. Paul to his Master is one of harmony and substantial agreement. From his own epistles we shall demonstrate that St. Paul did not regard himself as an innovator, and secondly we shall prove that he was not regarded as an innovator either by the apostles or by the early Church.

Nothing can prove more effectively that Christ was at once the Founder and the very substance of Christianity than St. Paul's own unquestioned statements, nothing demonstrates more overwhelmingly than the apostle's own epistles that it was not St. Paul that

made Christ, but Christ that made St. Paul what he was. For if St. Paul was in fact the founder of Christianity how is it that he constantly refers all his teaching and all his knowledge to the crucified and risen Christ? "For I judged not myself to know anything among you, but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified."<sup>60</sup> Whence his plain statement: "For we preach not ourselves, but Jesus Christ our Lord,"<sup>61</sup> and that "other foundation no men can lay but which is laid; which is Christ Jesus."<sup>62</sup> For the sake of the transcendence of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, the apostle was mulcted of all things and counted them to be a loss.<sup>63</sup> Christ is his very life: "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me."<sup>64</sup> Christ alone is His supreme glory: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>65</sup> The apostle constantly puts his own personality behind that of Christ in order that He alone may be preached, and is always yearning for the day to be dissolved and be with Him. In fact Christ is the "point central," the "idea maitresse" of all his epistles.<sup>66</sup> Open at random any one of his epistles, and infallibly some reference to the nature and works of the God-Man will be found. Surely, therefore, he who pronounces even an angel from heaven accursed if he preach any other Gospel than that of Christ, would have indignantly repelled the reproach of having essentially altered or disfigured the Gospel of Christ.

Again, Christianity existed before the conversion of St. Paul, and hence he was not its founder. In two of his speeches and four of his epistles, the apostle reverts to his persecution of the Church. Twice to the Galatians does he use the same strong metaphor which was applied to his conduct by the Damascene believers.<sup>67</sup> He tells the Corinthians that he is "the least of the apostles, not worthy to be called an apostle, because he persecuted the Church of God."<sup>68</sup> He reminds the Philippians that his old Hebraic zeal as a Pharisee had shown itself by his "persecuting the Church."<sup>69</sup> Even in his old age when he was thoroughly convinced that he was entirely forgiven

---

<sup>60</sup> I. Cor. II., 2.

<sup>61</sup> II. Cor. iv., 5.

<sup>62</sup> I. Cor. iii., 11.

<sup>63</sup> Phil. iii., 8.

<sup>64</sup> Gal. ii., 20.

<sup>65</sup> Gal. vi., 14.

<sup>66</sup> The name "Christ" appears 203 times in St. Paul's Epistles. "Christ Jesus" 92 times, "Jesus Christ" 84 times, "Lord" 157 times, "Lord Jesus" 24 times, "The Lord Jesus Christ" 64 times, "Jesus" 16 times. Besides these we find many other titles such as Saviour, Son of God, and other incidental phrases where our Lord is not mentioned directly by name.

<sup>67</sup> i., 13; i., 23.

<sup>68</sup> I. Cor. xv., 9.

<sup>69</sup> Phil. iii., 6.



by his Master, he cannot forget the bitter thought that, though in ignorance, he had once been "a blasphemer and a persecutor and contumelious."<sup>70</sup> And when speaking on the steps of the Tower of Antonia to the raging mob of Jerusalem, he tells them not only of the shedding of the blood of Stephen and of the binding and imprisonment of Christians, but also that "he persecuted this way unto death."<sup>71</sup> Finally, in his speech at Cæsarea, he says that armed with the high priest's authority he not only fulfilled unwittingly the prophecy of Christ<sup>72</sup> by scourging the Christians often and in every synagogue, but that when it came to a question of death he gave his vote against them, and compelled them to blaspheme.<sup>73</sup> But not only did Christianity and the Church exist before his conversion, as the above statements show, but they were already widely spread. For he speaks of the "churches of Judea which were in Christ,"<sup>74</sup> and when he was arrested on his way to Damascus, he was on an errand to persecute the Church even in that distant city. How then can St. Paul be said to be the founder of Christianity, which he did his very utmost to annihilate?

In this connection it may be interesting to ask why exactly did St. Paul persecute the Church. Was it not because he already knew a good deal about Christianity? He who laid waste and persecuted with unmeasured passion the Church of God must surely have known something about it. He was present at the trial of Stephen, heard his answers to the questions of the high priest, and approved of his death. Again, we learn from the Acts that Gamaliel was one of the Sanhedrin at the time that an inquiry was made into the missionary work of the apostles, and Paul assuredly must have heard his wise pleas for a toleration of Christianity.<sup>75</sup> At any rate he would not have persecuted the Christians unless he had known enough of their opinions to give him a reason for doing so. If Christianity owed most of its existing features to St. Paul, if from him it derived its conception of the Messiah, the idea of salvation apart from the law, its universalistic tendencies, if these had not existed in the early Church, there was no reason why St. Paul or any Pharisee should persecute it. He persecuted Christianity because it showed signs of a dangerous latitudinarianism which would break down the exclusiveness of Judaism, and destroy the rigor and supremacy of its legal system.

---

<sup>70</sup> I. Tim. i., 13.

<sup>71</sup> Acts xxii., 4.

<sup>72</sup> Mt. x., 17; Mk. xiii., 9.

<sup>73</sup> Acts xxvi., 11.

<sup>74</sup> Gal. i., 22.

<sup>75</sup> Acts v., 33-39.

Again, we must not suppose that the Christianity of the Gentile world was pure Paulinism. We cannot ignore those missionaries of whom many are unknown to history by name, but who labored efficiently before and at the same time as St. Paul. Before the missionary activity of the apostle began, Philip the Evangelist had already admitted the Ethiopian eunuch, and St. Peter had baptized Cornelius and his circle. And in the Acts we read that some of those who were dispersed by the persecution that arose on the occasion of Stephen's martyrdom, "when they entered unto Antioch, spoke also to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus."<sup>76</sup> In the Acts, it is true, St. Paul's labors are described at great length as we would naturally expect from St. Luke, who was a follower and admirer of the great apostle, while the author's treatment of the other apostles leaves much to be desired. But it would be a mistake to conclude from the incomplete narratives of the Acts that St. Paul was the only missionary. We know that the apostles of Jerusalem sent St. Peter and St. John to labor in Samaria,<sup>77</sup> and that the former made extensive journeys.<sup>78</sup> Again we read that St. Peter visited Antioch,<sup>79</sup> and very probably labored also at Corinth;<sup>80</sup> and from his own epistles we learn that he traveled considerably and that he wrote his first epistle from Rome, where as tradition attests, he planted the Christian faith. Hence, though St. Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, he was plainly not the first to preach the Gospel to them and admit them into the Christian Church.

This argument can be expanded by a consideration of the origin of the great Christian centres of the apostolic age. The first of these mother-churches is Jerusalem, but with the founding of this one St. Paul had nothing to do except to persecute it. The next mother-church is Antioch. But the seed of Christ's teaching was carried thither by some disciples from Cyrene and Cyprus, who fled from Jerusalem during the persecution that followed upon the martyrdom of St. Stephen.<sup>81</sup> They preached the teaching of Jesus not only to the Jewish colony, but also to the Greeks and Gentiles, and soon large numbers were converted. It was only when the church of Jerusalem heard of this occurrence that Barnabas and Paul were sent to Antioch.<sup>82</sup> So, too, the Church of Alexandria, the nucleus of a powerful patriarchate and the centre whence Christianity spread throughout all Egypt, was founded according to the

---

<sup>76</sup> Acts xi., 19-20.

<sup>77</sup> Acts viii., 15.

<sup>78</sup> Acts ix., 32.

<sup>79</sup> Gal. ii.

<sup>80</sup> I. Cor. i., 12; ix., 15.

<sup>81</sup> Acts xi., 19-20.

<sup>82</sup> Acts xi., 22-25.



constant tradition of both East and West not by St. Paul, but St. Mark the Evangelist. Finally we come to the mother-church of Rome, which in certain respects was the most important of all. The Gospel message was most probably brought hither already by the "advenae Romani,"<sup>83</sup> who were present at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. According to ancient tradition St. Peter came to Rome in the year 42, and it was only about the year 60 that St. Paul arrived as a prisoner, and exercised a vigorous apostolate during his sojourn. Several years before this, when the apostle wrote his epistle to the Romans, the Church in that city must already have been of many years standing.<sup>84</sup> The Church of Ephesus, which he established and organized,<sup>85</sup> and the churches which he founded in Asia, Macedonia, and Greece, never attained to such importance and influence as the great mother-churches mentioned above.

All the evidence which we have thus far accumulated is amply sufficient to show that St. Paul was not only a true disciple of his Master, but that in no sense can he be regarded as the founder of Christianity. Returning again to an examination of his epistles, we find not only remarkable coincidences and allusions,<sup>86</sup> but actual quotations of the teaching of Jesus. Thus, writing to the Christians on the subject of Christian marriage, he says: "But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord, commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband."<sup>87</sup> In the same epistle he appeals to the rule of Christ, when he maintains that as an apostle he has the right to expect the churches to support him: "So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel, should live by the gospel."<sup>88</sup> Again, he introduces his account of the Lord's Supper by the following words: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you."<sup>89</sup> He tells the Thessalonians "in the word of the Lord" that those who were still alive at the second advent should not be beforehand with, should gain no advantage or priority over those who slept.<sup>90</sup> In his Epistle to the Galatians, where he defends his teaching and his authority, he says that it was by revelation that Christ made known to him the mystery that the Gentiles are co-

<sup>83</sup> Acts ii., 10.

<sup>84</sup> Rom. i., 8; xvi., 19.

<sup>85</sup> Acts xix.

<sup>86</sup> Compare: Rom. xii., 14, 17, 20, with Mt. v., 44; Rom. xiii., 7, with Mt. xxii., 21; Rom. xiii., 9, with Mt. xxii., 39, 40; I Cor. vii., 10-11, with Mt. v., 32; I. Cor. ix., 13, with Lk. x., 7; I. Cor. xiii., 2, with Mt. xxvii., 20; I Cor. iv., 12, 13, with Lk. vi., 28; Gal. iv., 17, with Mt. xxiii., 13; I Thess. iv. 8, with Lk. x., 16. Cfr. P. Gardner: "The Religious Experience of St. Paul," pp. 143-150 (William S. Norgate: New York, 1913).

<sup>87</sup> I. Cor. vii., 10.

<sup>88</sup> I. Cor. ix., 14.

<sup>89</sup> I. Cor. xi., 23.

<sup>90</sup> I. Thess. iv., 14.

partakers and co-heirs of the promise in Christ Jesus.<sup>91</sup> And he definitely refers to the authority of the Lord in the Acts in a passage to which there is no parallel in the Gospels: "Remember the words of Our Lord Jesus how He Himself said, it is more blessed to give than to receive."<sup>92</sup> If the apostle does not appeal beyond these few instances to the Saviour's words to establish or defend his doctrines, we must remember that he was far from regarding the teaching of Jesus as a collection of sayings, a law or written letter, which he had nothing more to do than to quote at every turn. From the beginning Christ was for St. Paul not so much the herald or preacher of the Gospel as an object of the apostle's faith and teaching. To know what Jesus Christ had said or done seemed less important than to love Him and give oneself to Him.

In attempting to prove that St. Paul's teaching differed fundamentally from that of the early Church, some lay much stress upon a statement of the apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians, where he insists upon the independence of his gospel.<sup>93</sup> In this regard it must be noted in the first place that the apostle was favored with many revelations during his whole apostolic career. After his conversion the Lord directs him to go to Ananias, who becomes for him a channel of celestial communications. After his baptism the neophyte retires to the Arabian desert to meditate on the revelations received and to prepare his soul for new light. Three years later the Lord again speaks to him in the temple of Jerusalem,<sup>94</sup> and by revelation he goes to the same city to plead the cause of the Gentiles.<sup>95</sup> The Holy Ghost forbids him to preach in Asia,<sup>96</sup> "suffers him not to go into Bithynia,"<sup>97</sup> but drives him irresistibly into Macedonia,<sup>98</sup> It consoles him at Corinth after the rebuff in Athens,<sup>99</sup> leads him forcibly into Jerusalem in spite of the certainty of a long captivity,<sup>100</sup> and fills him with confidence when all hope of seeing Rome seems lost.<sup>101</sup> To these revelations is to be added above all

<sup>91</sup> Gal. i., 11-12.

<sup>92</sup> Acts xx., 35. "The books of the New Testament reflect, they did not originate the teaching of early Christianity. Moreover Our Lord originated the principles. It was these principles which inspired His followers; some of the words which are the product of and which taught those principles are preserved, some are not; but the result of them is contained in the words of the Apostles which worked out in a practical life the principles they had learned directly from the Christ." Sanday and Headlam: *Epistle to the Romans*, pp. 382-383 (Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1901).

<sup>93</sup> Gal. i., 12.

<sup>94</sup> Acts xxii., 18.

<sup>95</sup> Gal. ii., 2.

<sup>96</sup> Acts xvi., 6.

<sup>97</sup> Acts xvi., 7.

<sup>98</sup> Acts xvi., 9-10.

<sup>99</sup> Acts xviii., 9.

<sup>100</sup> Acts xx., 22-23.

<sup>101</sup> Acts xix., 21; xxiii., 11.

the grand ecstasy recorded in Second Corinthians which coincided approximately with the beginning of his active apostolate and which was perhaps an immediate preparation for his mission among the Gentiles. Not only, however, was St. Paul's whole missionary career under immediate divine guidance, but certain points of his teaching he received by direct revelation. The institution of the Eucharist, the indissolubility of marriage, the destiny of the just at the Parousia, certain great facts about the Resurrection,<sup>102</sup> the direct vision of the Saviour not only risen from the dead but exalted on the right hand of God, and especially the central and peculiar fact of his teaching, "the mystery of Christ," the free offer of salvation to the Gentiles, were undoubtedly all subjects of special revelation. As regards the life, miracles, discourses and the rest of Our Lord's teaching, these the apostle learned through human channels, for the history of revelation is against the fact that it is ever given unnecessarily.

But was St. Paul regarded as an innovator by the earlier disciples of Jesus? There were certain conservative Judaizers in the primitive Church who combated the apostle's doctrine of Christian freedom as a dangerous innovation. According to these the Jewish law was to be maintained even among the Gentile Christians; faith in Jesus was to be supplementary to it, not subversive of it. What then, was the relation of these Judaizers to the original apostles who were disciples of Jesus? According to Bauer, the relations between these was in the main friendly, but he holds that a conflict between St. Paul and the original apostles is a fundamental fact of apostolic history. This reconstruction of primitive Christian history is opposed by Ritsch and Harnack, who maintain that the conflict was between apostolic Christianity, including St. Paul and the apostles, and the Judaistic Christianity of St. Paul's opponents. The latter exercised no specific influence on the development of Christianity. The Catholic Church at the close of the second century was due to a natural process of degeneration of Pauline Christianity by the intrusion of Greek habits of thought.

In view of these various hypotheses we shall try to outline briefly St. Paul's relation to the early disciples and apostles of Our Lord. Immediately after his vision of Christ on the way to Damascus he was visited by a disciple named Ananias, who laid hands on him, baptized him, and gave him instructions. And the Acts continue: "And he was with the disciples that were at Damascus, for some days. And immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God."<sup>103</sup> Similarly in the year 34 we find St. Paul at Jerusalem, spending two weeks with Cephas and making inquiries con-

---

<sup>102</sup> I. Cor. xv., 22; I. Thess. iv., 15.

<sup>103</sup> Acts ix., 10.



cerning the ministry and resurrection of Christ.<sup>104</sup> Again, in the year 42 the faithful of the Church at Jerusalem, hearing that an important body of converts had been formed at Antioch, sent Barnabas to organize the new community. And "after a great multitude was added to the Lord, Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; whom when he had found he brought to Antioch. And they conversed there in the church a whole year, and they taught a great multitude, so that at Antioch the disciples were first named Christians."<sup>105</sup> Hence St. Paul's teaching in this nascent Christian Church must have been similar to that of Barnabas, whose assistant he was, for it would be an untenable paradox to maintain that Paul was here an independent teacher. The collaboration of St. Paul and Barnabas was not limited, however, to the common preaching at Antioch, but we find them both together on St. Paul's first missionary journey. They preached in Cyprus, in Pisidia and Lycaonia, returning finally to Antioch, where they abode "no small time with the disciples." Hence St. Paul knew whatever was known about Christ and His teaching in the Christian Church of Antioch.

Some critics who insist upon the radical distinction between St. Paul's Gospel and that preached by the original apostles appeal to the following passage in Galatians: "to me was committed the gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision. For he who wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also among the Gentiles."<sup>106</sup> But who does not see that here St. Paul meant to indicate, as the equivalent terms substituted in the succeeding verse show, not the dogmatic content, but the twofold destination of the gospel. The legitimate existence of two apostleships, one appointed for the evangelization of the Jew and the other for that of the Gentile, St. Paul indeed did admit, but never of two essentially different gospels.<sup>107</sup> Moreover the apostle ascribes these two apostleships and the abundant fruit they bore to one and the same act of God. If two hostile gospels are in question, it would have to be admitted that St. Paul attributes them equally to God as their supreme author. Hence the apostles could consistently give each other "the right hands of fellowship"<sup>108</sup> since they felt themselves to be standing on a common basis. St. Paul in another place expressly says that he went to Jerusalem by revelation and communicated to the other apostles the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles "lest perhaps he should run or had

---

<sup>104</sup> Gal. i., 18.

<sup>105</sup> Acts xi., 25-26.

<sup>106</sup> Gal. ii., 7-8.

<sup>107</sup> Rom. i., 16; Gal. i., 7-9.

<sup>108</sup> Gal. ii., 9.

run in vain."<sup>109</sup> In a passage of First Corinthians the Apostle shows how he estimated the work done by others alongside with himself and that which had been done before him in the Church.<sup>110</sup> So far from reproaching St. Peter for having built on a different foundation, he reckons him among those who were laboring on the building of God. And to God also he leaves the office of appraising the work of each.<sup>111</sup> In his Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul calls this primitive foundation "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone."<sup>112</sup> But why then did the Judaizers appeal to the original apostles against St. Paul? For if the former were as Pauline as Paul himself, why should they be preferred to him? The explanation is not difficult to find. It was the life, not the teaching of the original apostles which appeared to support the contention of the Judaizers. Outwardly and to a superficial observer the early Christians in Jerusalem continued as a mere Jewish sect. Inwardly, however, Christianity was from the beginning no mere continuation of Judaism, but a new religion. It was only when the Christian Church began to transcend the Jewish bounds that the division became apparent.

So, too, the rebuke of St. Peter at Antioch, apparently the strongest evidence of a conflict between St. Paul and the original apostles, is rather to be regarded as evidence to the contrary. The critics make too much of this controversy which we find recorded in Galatians: "But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that some came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision."<sup>113</sup> This passage, however, shows that in principle St. Peter recognized that the law of Moses was not binding upon Christians.<sup>114</sup> When he withdrew from the Gentile Christians to observe the Mosaic law of clean and unclean foods, it was not a question of principle, but of expediency, a concession to the scruples of the Jewish Christians. St. Paul himself says: "If thou being a Jew livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? For if I build up again the things that I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator."<sup>115</sup> These words presuppose that at first St. Peter took up the same position in regard to the Jews as St. Paul<sup>116</sup> and that only in

<sup>109</sup> Gal. ii., 2.

<sup>110</sup> I. Cor. iii., 10-11.

<sup>111</sup> I. Cor. iii., 22.

<sup>112</sup> Eph. ii., 20.

<sup>113</sup> Gal. ii., 11-12.

<sup>114</sup> Gal. ii., 9.

<sup>115</sup> Gal. ii., 14-18.

<sup>116</sup> Acts xi., 4; xv., 7 sq.

this single instance, from a fear of man which he more than once evinces, he weakly gave way to the Jewish Christians.. But unfortunately this action of the first apostle had the effect of making some of the Gentiles believe that the observance of the Law was obligatory on all, and against this St. Paul protested. We must also remember that St. Peter was an apostle of the Jewish Christians who had not yet been absolved from the Mosaic observances, and that his action was justifiable on the principles laid down elsewhere<sup>117</sup> by St. Paul himself. And, on the other hand, although St. Paul often condemned the Mosaic law, it was his hand that penned such beautiful passages concerning Israel as we find in his Epistle to the Romans.<sup>118</sup> He kept up constant communion with the church at Jerusalem, and faithfully cared for its wants by instituting frequent collections for the Jewish Christians among the Gentile churches.<sup>119</sup> And when we see in turn the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Macedonia and Greece ministering joyfully and often beyond their power to the Church in Judea, does this not betoken brotherly love and unity?

If we now turn to the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and of early Christian authors, we do not find in them any preponderant influence of St. Paul's teaching. If we search the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas we can hardly detect any Pauline influence in them. In the Epistles of Ignatius, Polycarp and Justin the Martyr we have only a few brief quotations or reminiscences. In the great writers of the second century such as Irenæus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, we find numerous quotations from the writings of the apostle, but in no way disproportionate to their quotations from the rest of the New Testament.<sup>120</sup> Nor is the type of doctrine that prevailed in the ancient Christian Church of a distinctively Pauline form. Thus if we examine the Apostle's Creed as well as the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds we find in them no specialties of so-called Paulinism. Amongst the Apostolic Fathers there is no definite form of Pauline doctrine,<sup>121</sup> while among the great authors of the second century, such as Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian, there is not one that can be characterized as pronouncedly Pauline. Harnack himself confesses that "Marcion was the first, and for a long time the only Gentile

<sup>117</sup> I. Cor. ix., 19-24; viii., 13.

<sup>118</sup> Rom. ix., 1-6; xi., 24-32.

<sup>119</sup> Gal. ii., 10; Rom. x., 25; I. Cor. xvi.; II. Cor. viii., 9.

<sup>120</sup> Cfr. Lightfoot, "Apostolic Fathers" (Macmillan & Co., New York, 1890); Part II., Vol. II., pp. 520-526; Part I., Vol. II., pp. 515-517. Cfr. also indexes in "Ante-Nicene Fathers" (Scribner's Sons, New York, 1905).

<sup>121</sup> Lightfoot, *o. c.*, Part I., Vol. I., pp. 95-96, 397 sq.; Part II., Vol. I., pp. 403, 584.



Christian who took his stand on Paul,"<sup>122</sup> and that the "later development of the Church cannot be explained from Paulinism."<sup>123</sup> Similarly Weizsäcker admits that "when we review the development of Christian theology in the period subsequent to Paul, we are astonished to find that only a part of his work was taken up and carried out."<sup>124</sup>

The recognition of a distinction more or less fundamental between the gospel of Jesus and the gospel of St. Paul is established by the critics in the first place by the thoroughgoing criticism which the apostle in developing his doctrine of justification by faith brought to bear upon the law. St. Paul labors to show the episodical character of the Law, he belittles it, denounces it, almost as if it were hostile to the will of God. He rejoices in the conviction that for the believers in Christ it has ceased to be authoritative. Such views, however, seem to be foreign to the synoptic Gospels. It is nowhere therein stated that the Law was abrogated and that it was only a parenthetical expression of God's will. For indeed was not the Law divine, and was it not delivered among the terrors of Sinai? Could it have been enforced on one nation if it had not been intended for all? Did not Our Lord Himself live as a conscientious Jew, pay His visits regularly to the Temple, and inculcate obedience to those who sat on the chair of Moses? Had He not Himself been obedient to the commandments? If a distinction was to be drawn between commandments ceremonial and moral, where were the traces of any distinction in the legislation itself or in the words of Christ? Had he not bidden the leper to go show himself to the priest and offer for his cleansing such things as Moses had commanded for a testimony unto them?<sup>125</sup> Had he not said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law and the Prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill."<sup>126</sup> Had He not even said: "Till heaven and earth shall pass away, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the Law till all be fulfilled"<sup>127</sup>

A contrast in language such as this, is capable of being stated in a very trenchant style, and may without difficulty be pressed into apparently absolute contradiction. If Our Lord said that He came to fulfill the Law, He also said many things which showed that these words had a deeper meaning than the "prima facie" application which might be attached to them. In the first place, Christ distinguished

<sup>122</sup> "History of Dogma" (Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1899). Vol. I., p. 284.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 148-149.

<sup>124</sup> "Apostolic Age" (Williams & Norgate, London, 1912), Vol. I., p. 173.

<sup>125</sup> Mt. viii., 4; Mk. i., 44.

<sup>126</sup> Mt. v., 17.

<sup>127</sup> Mt. v., 8; Lk. xvi., 17.

between the Law and the official teachers of the Law. For the latter he has nothing but woes and commends them only in a very limited sense.<sup>128</sup> As regards the Law He frequently opposes the "I say" to the commands of Moses<sup>129</sup> and considers the Mosaic Law as capable of improvement.<sup>130</sup> Jesus had indeed come to fulfill and not to destroy the Law. But what a change that fulfillment implies: "The Law and the Prophets were till John. Since that time the kingdom is preached."<sup>131</sup> The Gospel is not merely a new presentation of the Law, but a new revelation. Certain features are common to both the new covenant and the Old Testament, namely the moral precepts, and in this sense the Law will persevere in all its integrity.<sup>132</sup> Our Lord reduces the whole Law to two commandments,<sup>133</sup> and tells us that the whole of it is fulfilled if we observe the golden rule of Christian morality. Certain other features of the old order, however, will either be fulfilled in their antetypes or being proper only to the Old Testament, will find no place in the New. These latter are the ceremonial and civil laws. Thus, for example, Our Lord dispensed His disciples from fasting,<sup>134</sup> and justified His action by two parables, which manifest the dualism of the Law and the Gospel, and show the imprudence of incorporating in the new dispensation observances that were proper to the old. Similarly, by the enumeration of a single principle: "That which cometh out of a man, that defileth a man," Jesus branded whole sections of the Mosaic Law with unimportance—all that had to do with uncleanness and purification. Again, every adult Jew was bound by the Law to pay half a shekel every year as temple dues, but Our Lord claims exemption for the children of the kingdom from the Mosaic tax.<sup>135</sup> Holier than the didrachma, however, was the temple, but even with its service Jesus dispenses.<sup>136</sup> When the world will have been redeemed by Him, its sacrifice will be replaced by the clean oblation foretold by Malachy. Finally, to take another example of Christ's attitude to the Law, the observance of the Sabbath was a precept of prime importance in the Old Testament, but Our Lord six times vindicated for the Sabbath a larger freedom than the Scribes admitted. Hence the divergences between Christ and St. Paul are more apparent than real. They are largely due to the different experience which Jesus and St. Paul respectively had of the Law,

---

<sup>128</sup> Mt. xxiii., 2, 4, xxvii., 15; Lk. xi., 46.

<sup>129</sup> Mt. v., 38.

<sup>130</sup> Mt. xix., 4-9.

<sup>131</sup> Lk. xvi., 16.

<sup>132</sup> Mt. v., 8; Lk. xvi., 17.

<sup>133</sup> Mt. xxii., 37; vii., 12.

<sup>134</sup> Mk. ii., 18-20.

<sup>135</sup> Mt. xxvii., 25.

<sup>136</sup> Mt. xii., 6; Jn., iv., 21-23.

and to the fact that whereas the criticism of the apostle was directed against the system, that of Our Lord was aimed at the persons who represented it. Both repudiate it insofar as it contained and sought to enforce ceremonial precepts the effect of which was to lead men to be satisfied with their performance, and both appeal from it to the divine purpose of which it was a relative expression.

The second main and even more important group of divergences is that connected with the teaching of St. Paul as to the Person and work of Christ. Can the Jesus of the synoptic Gospels, it is asked, be the Eternal Son in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead of the Epistle to the Colossians? The problem, however, as thus stated, no longer presents serious difficulties. The day is now past when the divine Christ of the Pauline epistles is confronted with the human Christ of St. Mark. Historical students of all shades of opinion have come to see that St. Mark as well as St. Paul present an exalted Christology, and it is not necessary to enumerate here the many proofs and arguments in favor of this fact. But not only is St. Paul in agreement with the synoptics, but he everywhere appears in perfect harmony with all Palestinian Christians. In the whole New Testament there is not a trace of a conflict, and this remarkable absence of struggle between the Pauline and the primitive conception can only be explained if the two were essentially the same. St. Paul had been in direct consultation with St. Peter and there is every reason to believe that from the very beginning the exalted Christology of St. Paul was accepted by the Church of Jerusalem. And ever since that time the gospel narrative and the theology of the Pauline epistles were received without misgiving by countless generations of Christian theology and Christian devotion. It is only in modern times that in spite of this unanimous belief of eighteen centuries, a Harnack, a Strauss, a Renan, a Drews, a Kaltloff, a Schmiedel, a Roberts, a Campbell, and others, have deigned to give us a true picture of Christ, and to point out the mistake of the apostles!<sup>137</sup> And finally, we must remember that between Our Lord and St. Paul there stand certain facts which both account for and justify the additional features in the Pauline teaching. The gospels create but leave unsatisfied a demand for an interpretation of Our Lord's function in the world, of His death, and of His Resurrection.

The problem, however, of the relation of the epistles to the synoptics has in later years taken on a new and more formidable aspect. It is now maintained by the critics that the gospels, especially the

---

<sup>137</sup> In regard to modern conceptions of the Person and Nature of Christ see S. N. Rostron. "Christology of St. Paul," pp. 196-229. (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1912.)



fourth, were written after St. Paul's epistles, and that they were affected by Pauline teaching. To a certain extent it is no longer the historical Jesus which the gospels describe, but the Pauline Christ. Accordingly, there is not a single document which presents a pre-Pauline conception of Christ. Hence any comparisons between the two are valueless. According to certain critics, as Brückner and Wrede, St. Paul's Christology had its origin in the Jewish Apocalypses and after his conversion was identified with Jesus of Nazareth. If this contention were true, then of course the very foundation of our arguments for the Divinity of Christ is destroyed. But this supposition has not even a semblance of truth. In order that Pauline conceptions should be able to affect the evangelical material by additions and modifications it is necessary to suppose that the material was at the time in a fairly fluid state, capable of responding to the moulding of a later scheme of thought, and that effective contact was established between the two. But granted these conditions, is it possible to explain how the traces of Pauline influence are so few in number? Why did it leave so much of the gospel material unaltered and especially those passages which now suggest antinomy between Our Lord and St. Paul.<sup>138</sup> It is inconceivable also that the Pauline conception could gain ascendancy over the primitive conception without a struggle, but of such we have no trace. In the supposed Pauline passages the writers are quite unaware that one view is being replaced by another. This conclusion is supported by the positive evidence which has recently been urged for dating the gospels at a time when the Pauline epistles, even if some of them had already been written, could not have been collected and begun to dominate the Church at large. Hence the belief in the divinity of Christ in the primitive Church was not due to any Pauline influences but found its justification in the Divine Jesus Himself. For it is inconceivable that the early Christians came to regard the man Jesus as a divine being immediately after His death. Such an apotheosis of Jesus, as even critics of the most thoroughgoing naturalistic principles admit, would be absolutely unique, preternaturally rapid and unparalleled in the religious history of the race.<sup>139</sup>

In like manner all the other fundamental doctrines of St. Paul are already to be found in the teaching of Jesus in the gospels. Thus the idea that the kingdom of God was to be extended far beyond the boundaries of Israel was explicitly taught by Our Lord<sup>140</sup> and inculcated by His actions;<sup>141</sup> moreover innumerable sayings of the

<sup>138</sup> Compare Mk. x., 15, and vii., 27.

<sup>139</sup> Lepin, "Christ and the Gospel" (J. J. McVay, 1910), pp. 129, 133, 176-183.

<sup>140</sup> Mt. xxviii., 9; v., 13, 14; Mt. viii., 11; Lk. xiii., 29; Mt. xxi., 43.

<sup>141</sup> Mt. iv., 15; xv., 21.

prophets already predicted the reception of the heathen into the kingdom of God.<sup>142</sup> Again, St. Paul's doctrine of universal sinfulness<sup>143</sup> of the atonement,<sup>144</sup> of salvation by faith,<sup>145</sup> his teaching concerning Christ's headship over the angelic world,<sup>146</sup> his contrast between the spirit and the flesh,<sup>147</sup> are all to be found in the Gospel narrative. The same is true with regard to the organization and ordinances of the Church. The offices of deacon,<sup>148</sup> of elder,<sup>149</sup> and of evangelist,<sup>150</sup> and the sacraments<sup>151</sup> are all pre-Pauline. Even those elements in the teaching of Jesus which by modern critics are regarded as most characteristic of Him, namely the Fatherhood of God and love as the fulfilling of the law are to be found in St. Paul's epistles.<sup>152</sup> The invocation of God under the name of Father, which comes directly from the gospel, is a familiar invocation to St. Paul.<sup>153</sup> So, too, the apostle's whole life of tactful adaptation to varying conditions, of restless energy and untold hardships exemplify his love not only of Christ, but also of those for whom Christ died. And if St. Paul presents the teaching of his Master in a different form at times, we must remember that this is largely due to his peculiar Rabbinical and Hellenic education. The remarkable thing is that Christ's teaching should be so faithfully reproduced in St. Paul's epistles as it actually is.

III. What was then St. Paul's distinctive contribution to Christianity? St. Paul may be called the creator of Christianity because of his more definite formulation of the faith. Though in his epistles there is no specific creed, yet almost all his statements bear the impress of careful thought. The main beliefs of the early Church were already in the process of being formulated and certain traces of this can be seen in the epistles. The confession, "Jesus is Lord," with all that it implied was general among the Christian believers. Then there is the theological argument,<sup>154</sup> the gospels of the Incarnation<sup>155</sup> and Ascension,<sup>156</sup> certain Trinitarian phrases,<sup>157</sup> and the final benediction of Second Corinthians.<sup>158</sup> Especially do we find a more

<sup>142</sup> Micah iv., 1-4; Is. ii., 2-4; xix., 18-25; Ps. xxii., 28.

<sup>143</sup> Rom. iii., 23; Mt. vii., 11.

<sup>144</sup> Mt. xx., 28; Mk. x., 45.

<sup>145</sup> Lk. xviii., 14.

<sup>146</sup> Eph. i., 20; Mt. xxviii., 18.

<sup>147</sup> Mt. xxvi., 41.

<sup>148</sup> Acts vi.

<sup>149</sup> Acts xi., 30.

<sup>150</sup> Acts viii.

<sup>151</sup> Rom. vi., 3, 4; I. Cor. xi., 23-29.

<sup>152</sup> Rom. xiii., 8-10; Gal. iv., 1-7; I. Thess. i., 1.

<sup>153</sup> Rom. viii., 15-17.

<sup>154</sup> I. Cor. viii., 6.

<sup>155</sup> Phil. ii., 6-11.

<sup>156</sup> Eph. i., 20-23.

<sup>157</sup> Eph. iv. 4-6; Col. i., 3, 4, 8.

<sup>158</sup> II. Cor. xiii., 4.

detailed enunciation of the doctrine which forms the central idea of all the Pauline epistles, namely, the redemption. St. Paul's teaching, which is Christocentric, is at base a soteriology, not from a subjective standpoint as was held by the founders of Protestantism, who made justification by faith the essence of Paulinism, but from the objective viewpoint, embracing the person and work of the Redeemer. From Calvary as from a central point of observation, the apostle examines the mystery in all its different aspects. Since the redemption was conditioned by the fall of our first parents, St. Paul proceeds to describe not only its author and its consequences, but also its antecedents. The apostle's development of the doctrine contains the following constitutive elements: God's plan of the redemption, the contrast of the two Adams, the antithesis between flesh and spirit, the function and purpose of the Law, the atoning death of Christ, justification by faith, the resurrection of Christ as an intrinsic complement of the redemption, the sacraments, and, finally, the fruits of the redemption. But in this connection we must again remember that St. Paul did not originate the doctrine of the redemption. It already existed as a historical fact in the Crucifixion. The germ of the teaching is already to be found in the Gospels,<sup>159</sup> and St. Paul only gave us a fuller and more detailed statement of the atoning significance of Christ's death.

In view of what has just been said above, it is to be expected that the central point of St. Paul's "gospel" would be the universal reconciliation and redemption of all men in and by Christ. The "gospel" of Paul, also called at times the "mystery of God" or the "mystery of Christ," is a plan of salvation conceived by God from all eternity, hidden in the penumbra of the old revelation, insinuated by the prophets, and now solemnly proclaimed to the whole universe, a plan whereby Christ is to be a universal Saviour and a common hope, not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles.<sup>160</sup> This was in his eyes "the mystery which hath been hidden from ages and generations, but now is manifested to his saints."<sup>161</sup> This according to the Ephesians was the "mystery which in other generations was not

<sup>159</sup> Mk. x., 45; Mt. xx., 28.

<sup>160</sup> "Paul entend sans doute par 'son evangile' la forme speciale que prenaît, le message du salut en passant du judaïsme a la gentilité, le tour qui caracterise sa predication dans les milieux païens. Ce serait donc en premiere ligne l'egalite des hommes dans le plan redempteur, l'admission des Gentils dans l'Eglise sur le meme pied que les Juifs, l'abolition de la Loi mosaïque, la liberte qui en resulte pour tous, specialement pour les chretiens sortis du paganisme, la justification des hommes par la foi independamment des oeuvres de la Loi; l'incorporation des fideles au Christ par le baptême, l'union de tous en lui avec la communion des saints qui en est le corollaire, en un mot toutes les proprietes du corps mystique du Christ." F. Prat: "La Theologie de Saint Paul," Vol. I., p. 53. (Beauchesne, Paris, 1908.)

<sup>161</sup> Col. i., 26.



known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body, and co-partners of His promise in Christ Jesus, by the gospel."<sup>162</sup> It is this breaking down of the middle wall of partition which causes St. Paul to rejoice with great joy. This was the supreme truth of that "gospel" which St. Paul received "not of man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ,"<sup>163</sup> and which was characterized by this special feature that it proclaimed salvation for the Gentiles apart from any necessity of coming under the Law of Moses. To this is due the title which he gives it, "the gospel of the uncircumcision,"<sup>164</sup> as well as the propriety of communicating its specific character to the leaders in Jerusalem.<sup>165</sup>

It is clear, therefore, that a closer examination of the relation between the teaching of Jesus and that of St. Paul confirms our primary contention that St. Paul reproduces in a very remarkable way the mind of Christ. The ultimate source of the apostle's teaching was the life and words of Our Lord; and equally did he share with the Apostolic Church the main elements of his teaching. At his conversion he accepted the belief that Jesus was the Christ, and at this moment also the foundation of his doctrinal system was laid. He perceived in himself a powerful spiritual change, and under this influence and with the aid of divine revelation and inspiration he worked out for the world the full significance of the life, death and resurrection of Christ. Radical critics in reconstructing primitive Christianity maintain that St. Paul was not a disciple of Jesus. We admit their contention; he was not a disciple of the Jesus which liberal criticism has constructed, but he was a disciple of the Jesus whom we find depicted in the Gospels.

RUDOLPH G. BANDAS, B. A.

St. Paul, Minn.

---

<sup>162</sup> Eph. i., 1-13.

<sup>163</sup> Gal. i., 12.

<sup>164</sup> Gal. ii., 7.

<sup>165</sup> Gal. ii., 2.

## LOUVAIN.

AS IS now matter of history, one of the places which suffered most in the great war was Louvain, the fine old city, once the capital of Brabant, the city so famous for art and learning that it has been called the Athens of Belgium.

For the ordinary tourist remaining but a short time, and satisfied with a superficial glance, this dull old city on the Dyle had but little interest. Over the whole place there was an atmosphere of dinginess, of lifelessness. One quickly tired of the new portion, though its streets were wide and straight, yet wearisome and monotonous because of their regularity, whilst for the casual observer, as we have said, the somewhat gloomy mediæval quarter, so rich in historic associations, had little or no attraction.

From the beginning of the eleventh century Louvain—the name is derived from *loc* (a wooded height), and *veen* (a marble)—was the residence of a long line of counts who later succeeded in getting possession of the duchy of Lower Lorraine, where they assumed the title of Dukes of Brabant.

At one period of its history, notably in the fourteenth century, like many other Flemish cities, Louvain was very prosperous and of great importance, one of the chief centres of Continental commerce, numbering close on 200,000 inhabitants, most of whom were engaged in the cloth trade. A very turbulent set these weavers seem to have been, constantly in revolt against the authorities.

Wandering through the silent, deserted streets of the old town, a stranger found it hard to realize that they were once the scene of busy life, once were filled with a noisy, excitable population, and that they constantly reëchoed to the sound of strife. Often, before to-day, in the course of its history, have the streets of Louvain been reddened with blood.

In 1378, during a more than usually violent outbreak or insurrection, thirteen of the magistrates of the city, all of them patricians, were flung from the windows of the Hotel de Ville, to be dispatched by the spears of the revolutionary mob thirsting for their blood in the street below. In 1382, Duke Wenceslaus of Brabant, in revenge for this massacre, imposed such heavy taxes on the people that 100,000 of them migrated, numbers to Holland, but the majority to England, taking with them the secrets of their trade. From that time may be dated the decline in Louvain's material prosperity and importance.

But the chief glory of Louvain, that which made her famous amongst the learned of every nation, has ever been her University,

which was founded in 1425, by Pope Martin II., at the instance of John III., Duke of Burgundy. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as many as 6,000 students yearly flocked to this great centre of learning and numbers of illustrious sons spread the fame of their alma mater throughout Europe. During these two centuries Louvain ranked high amongst the great Continental schools as a centre of learning and culture.

The world to-day is the poorer for the destruction of Louvain, but Ireland in particular has cause to mourn the ruin which has come upon the old University city. During the darkest days in her history, when persecution had quenched the lamp of learning in the land, Louvain opened her hospitable gates and welcomed to the halls of her famous University Irish students, Irish priests, some of whom studied there long before the foundation of the Irish Franciscan College. Amongst these early students was Archbishop O'Hurley, of Cashel, who afterwards received the crown of martyrdom.

The first Irish college in Louvain was founded by Eugene Matthews, who was appointed Archbishop of Dublin in 1611, being translated from the Diocese of Clogher. Driven into exile, Archbishop Matthews retired to Louvain, where in 1623 he founded a college for Irish students which ranked as the nineteenth in the records of the University. Archbishop Matthews' death occurred in the same year.

Early in the seventeenth century we find the name of Peter Lombard, the son of a wealthy merchant of Waterford, and afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, inscribed amongst those of the most distinguished students of Louvain University, which at that time had twenty-nine colleges under its constitution, then regarded as one of the first in Europe.

Peter Lombard remained in Louvain for fifteen years, and during these years his reputation for learning attracted the attention of Pope Clement VIII. Lombard was made Provost of Cambrai, and finally, in 1598, was chosen Archbishop of Armagh.

The state of Ireland rendering it unsafe for him to appear in his diocese, where he died in 1625, he was succeeded in the archiepiscopal see by Hugh MacCaghwell (Cavellus), a native of the County Down. Educated at Salamanca, MacCaghwell had joined the Franciscan Order in that city, and for many years held the chair of theology in the Louvain University. It was during his stay in Louvain that Florence Conry, Archbishop of Tuam, with the learned theologian's assistance, prevailed on Philip III. to found the Irish Franciscan College of St. Anthony of Padua.

In 1626, Pope Paul III. appointed Hugh MacCaghwell Archbishop of Armagh. Whilst preparing to go to Ireland, the newly



consecrated Archbishop was seized with sudden illness and died in Rome on September 22, 1626. He was buried in the Church of St. Isidore, where a monument was erected to his memory by John O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone.

Florence Conry, the Archbishop of Tuam, to whose exertions was due the foundation of the Irish Franciscan College in Louvain, was born somewhere in Connaught, the exact place of his birth not being recorded. At an early age he went to Madrid, where, whilst still a youth, he became a Franciscan. He was remarkable for his great learning, and still more so for his meek and gentle disposition, which rendered him universally beloved. He was raised to the archiepiscopal dignity by Pope Clement VIII. All Irish Bishops at that period, who, if not put to death, were exiled. Archbishop Conry was forced to leave Ireland. He sought refuge in the dominion of Philip II., who generously provided for his maintenance. The Archbishop died in Madrid, but was buried in Louvain in the Church of the Irish Franciscans, where a splendid monument testified to the loving veneration in which he was held. Another Irish Archbishop intimately connected with the famous University was Edmond O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh, who held the office of rector from 1637 to 1640.

Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, a young man named Hugh Ward, a native of Donegal, entered the Franciscan Order at Salamanca. He devoted much time and labor to Irish antiquarian research. Whilst thus engaged, he was sent to Louvain as guardian of the Irish College, where amongst his contemporaries were Michael O'Clery (Cleirigh), afterwards famous as the chief compiler of the "Annals of Donegal," or as they are now known, "The Annals of the Four Masters," and John Colgan, who wrote the lives of the Irish saints, under the title "Acta Sanctorum." Ward, O'Clery and Colgan were all three natives of Donegal. Ward availed himself of O'Clery's assistance in his antiquarian researches, and Colgan, who was professor of theology at Louvain, also enlisted his aid for the "Lives of the Irish Saints." Accordingly, O'Clery was sent to Ireland, where he remained for twenty years. During that time he collected "an enormous quantity of historical matter, annals, chronicles, genealogies, biographies, family and clan histories, tales, poems and those legends and traditions which still survived amongst the people." From time to time as his work progressed, he sent the documents to Louvain. But meanwhile, O'Clery conceived the idea of compiling a work greater than anything yet undertaken by his brethren. With the mass of materials, he had collected, he settled down about 1630, near the ruined monastery of Donegal, and there determined to write "The Annals of

Ireland" from the earliest times to the death of Hugh O'Neill. His brothers, Peregrine and Conary, with his cousin, Fearfesa O'Mulconry, who, like himself, were skilled in Irish history and antiquities, assisted him in the work, which was written entirely in Irish. This work is now known as "The Annals of the Four Masters."

After O'Clery's death in 1643, the MS. of his huge work remained in the Louvain Library, until so late as the nineteenth century, when O'Donovan, the celebrated Irish scholar, undertook the task of translating and editing this marvelous record of Ireland's history. John Colgan died somewhere about 1663 at Louvain, whilst Hugh Ward was killed in 1635 outside Prague, then besieged by the Elector of Saxony.

In 1624, an Irish Dominican college was founded at Louvain, which speedily attained great celebrity, students flocking to it from all parts. In 1665, three brothers of the name of Joyce, from Galway, fitted up a large house in a healthy part of the town as a college for the Dominicans. In 1668, the illustrious Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, consecrated a beautiful Dominican Church, built close to the College founded by the brothers Joyce. In 1626, Isabella, Governor of Belgium, obtained from her nephew, Philip IV., of Spain, an annual pension of 1,200 florins—£100 sterling—for the students, "who, up to this time had been supported by their friends at home."

In the eighteenth century, Belgium passed under the dominion of Austria and in 1749 the Government of that country, having first refused to pay the pension, reduced it to 400 florins, adding the condition that it should be begged for as an alms each year.

There are few churches in Rome which possess greater interest for Irish visitors than that of San Pietro in Montorio, which stands on the top of the Janiculum. For there beneath the marble pavement before the high altar sleep the exiled chieftains of Tyrone and Tyrconnell. There is no more touching episode in the history of Ireland than that of the "Flight of the Earls." "Driven to despair, and recognizing that their cause was lost, the two Earls resolved to accept the means of escape provided for them. They had been informed that a vessel to convey them away from Ireland was then lying at anchor in Lough Swilly under French colors. At midday on Friday, feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, 1609, the Earl of Tyrone, accompanied by the Earl of Tyrconnell, went on board the vessel, which was to bear them from the shores of Ireland, which they were never to behold again. The party on board, including kinsfolk and retainers, numbered ninety-four. They were Hugh, Earl of Tyrone, his wife, Catherine, and three sons, Hugh, John and Bernard. With O'Neill's party went Art Oge, 'Young

Arthur,' son of Cormack, Tyrone's brother, and a great many more of the great Earl's clan. Accompanying Rory O'Donnell were his son, Hugh, barely a year old; his brother Cathbar, with his wife, the Lady Rosa O'Dougherty and her infant son, Hugh, with others of their friends and followers. 'A distinguished crew,' wrote the Four Masters, 'was this for one ship, for it is certain that the sea never carried, and that the winds never wafted from the Irish shores individuals more illustrious or noble in genealogy, or more renowned for deeds of valor, prowess and high achievements. Would that God,' continued the Four Masters, 'had but permitted them to remain in their patrimonial inheritances until the children should arrive at the age of manhood.'

"The exiles encountered severe storms and suffered great discomfort owing to the smallness of the vessel, which was not suited to carry so many passengers. At last on October 4, twenty-one days after they had sailed from Donegal, they landed at Quillebreuf, their provisions being then reduced to one gallon of beer and one cask of water."

As the exiles passed through France and Belgium on their way to Rome, they were everywhere received with all the honors accorded to princes. Louvain was their last halting place before setting out on their Roman journey. Here, in the old city which sheltered so many of their fellow-exiles, they might, indeed, for a brief while, forget that they were in a foreign land. They were lodged with much state in the palace where the Emperor Charles V. had spent his boyhood. They remained in Louvain for some months, and on their departure they left behind O'Neill's two sons, John and Brian, with Hugh O'Donnell's baby son and his sister Nuala. The Archdukes made liberal provision for the maintenance of these honored guests entrusted to their care. O'Neill's son, Brian, was given into the charge of the Irish Franciscans, whose new College of St. Anthony of Padua was then in course of erection. Henry O'Neill, the Earl's brother, took John to train him as a soldier. On the 28th of February the illustrious exiles set out for Rome, escorted by a squadron of cavalry commanded by Henry O'Neill, then serving in the Spanish army. At Lucerne, they were lodged in the palace of the Papal Nuncio, who had received orders from Pope Paul V. to treat them as princes.

The chief architectural glory of Louvain was the Hotel de Ville, erected in 1448, a most beautiful specimen of late Gothic architecture, which it is said has a wealth of architectural decoration such as is to be found scarcely anywhere else on the Continent. Fortunately, this beautiful building, it seems, escaped the terrible destruction



wrought on the Church of St. Pierre, which as a masterpiece of architecture ranked second only to the Hotel de Ville.

The building of this church, which stands on the site of a much older edifice, was begun in 1425; it was finished in the early part of the sixteenth century. St. Pierre, like the Hotel de Ville, was built in the late Gothic style and possesses some beautiful sculptures and panels, the work of Quentin Matsy. It contained seven chapels, in one of which was a carved painted statue of our Lord dating from the fourteenth century. In another chapel was a beautiful stone Gothic tabernacle, forty feet high, which was executed in 1450; in this chapel was also a gilded wooden statue of Our Lady with her Divine Child, carved in 1441. This statue was known by the title of "*Sedes Sapientiae*," and at its feet it was customary for the doctors of theology to lay their profession of faith. The church also contained the tombs of Henry I., Duke of Brabant, founder of the earlier church, who died in 1235, and of his wife, Matilda of Flanders, who was buried with her daughter.

But the great treasures of St. Pierre were two paintings, now wholly destroyed. An art critic writes of these lost masterpieces as follows: "The chief treasures of the Church of St. Pierre de Louvain were two famous paintings by Dierick (or Thierry) Bouts, who is as closely identified with the now destroyed University city of Belgium as are the Van Dycks with Ghent and Bruges, and Roger van der Weyden with Tournai and Brussels. The earlier of these paintings is (or rather was) the remarkable triptych with the martyrdom of St. Erasmus in the central panel and the figures of St. Jerome and St. Bernard in the wings. But perhaps the masterpiece of Dierick Bouts, and certainly one of the finest examples of Flemish fifteenth century art was the polyptych painted by him for the altar of the Blessed Sacrament in the Collegiate Church of St. Pierre. The centre panel of this work whereon was represented the Last Supper, was the chief adornment of that church and of the ancient city."

The Library of the Louvain University, scattered to the winds in fire and ashes, was one of the finest in Belgium, consisting of 150,000 volumes, and innumerable valuable MSS. Fortunately the beautiful Celtic manuscripts in the Irish College were taken to Ireland forty years ago, and are now safe in the library of the Franciscan Fathers, Dublin.

Already the restoration of Louvain has been planned and the work, we believe, has been entrusted to American hands. Louvain, we are told, will arise phoenix-like from its ashes; a new University will spring into existence, whose glories will rival that of the ancient

one. It may be, probably will be, that a new, a stately Louvain will arise on the site of the dull, gray old town, with a splendid University and fine colleges. But this new city will be a stranger to us. The ancient city with all its memories, its traditions has passed away forever. No power on earth can restore it to us. For who can recall the dead past, and bid it live again? All those memories which clung to the old Louvain, making it so precious to us, have passed to the silent land, and now, like them, the city haunted by their shadows has passed, too, is but a memory. "The mill will never grind again with the waters that are past." And so to the olden city of Louvain we bid farewell, an eternal farewell.

E. LEAHY.

Dublin.

SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT MEXICO  
THAT ARE NOT MYTHICAL.

THE history of Mexico is unique. Things happen there, even in our own generation, that would be unthinkable in any other country in the world. For instance: In 1828, the Masonic party of the Escoseses, or Scottish Rite, unexpectedly presented General Pedraza as their candidate for the presidency of the Republic, against General Guerrero, the candidate of the Yorkinos, or Masons of the York Rite. Pedraza was elected by a majority of only two votes. Santa Ana claimed that this result did not represent the will of the people. With a following of five hundred men, he took possession of the Castle of Perote and issued a proclamation declaring the election a fraud upon the people and asserting Guerrero, the Yorkino candidate to be the legal Presidente. Pedraza declared against him; he was besieged at Perote, and after a heated action made his escape, but was eventually captured. While his pursuers had been hunting him down important events had taken place at the capital and by one of those turns in affairs, incomprehensible outside of Mexico, the captured general, within twenty-four hours after his capture, returned to the capital, in triumph, *at the head of the very army that had been sent out to capture him.*

There are instances during the revolutions of that period, in which generals, after a hard fight, passed over to the army they had been trying to slaughter. But all this belongs to the modern history of Mexico, and the purpose of this paper is to bring out some features in the ancient history not usually accessible to the general reader. We are accustomed to regard the history of Mexico as a continuous record of revolutions, and few of us realize that its history is really the ancient history of America. It will surprise many of us to find that it can be traced back uninterruptedly to the year 719-720, when Icoatzin founded the Toltec monarchy.

True, the early history of the people who inhabited the central plateau (Mesa Central) of Anahuac is shrouded in doubt and uncertainty; it is vague, indeed, and perhaps belongs to the realms of fable, and none of the writers on ancient Mexico seems to agree as to where the kingdom of Herehuetlapatlan was located. A line of thirteen Chichimecan monarchs<sup>1</sup> is given, covering a period of over

<sup>1</sup> These Chichimecan rulers were (don't try to pronounce them): 1, Nequameur; 2, Namocuix; 3, Miscohuatl; 4, Huitzilopochtli; 5, Huslmuc; 6, Nauvotl; 7, Quauhtepetla; 8, Nonohualca; 9, Huetzin; 10, Quauhtonal; 11, Masatzin; 12, Quetzal; 13, Icoatzin. I will not be responsible for the length of each individual reign. According to the historian, these Kings were all of the tribe of Mathusalem.



one thousand years, and this brings us down to A. D. 719-720, the period of the Toltecan kings. In this year Icoatzin founded the Toltecan monarchy, placing his son on the throne, and he was followed by eight sovereigns of that dynasty, the last being Tupiltzin (1103). Previous to the discovery of Mexico and its conquest by Cortez, there was little or no means of knowing anything concerning the people who inhabited the country, their customs, their religion, and their form of government. Close upon the heels of the conquerors came the missionaries of different orders, who soon learned their language. They gathered together the pictures and maps that had escaped destruction; they listened attentively to the narratives of the old men among the natives, observed their customs and their religious rites and recorded them in books. This constitutes the basis of the ancient history, and, observing a natural and logical order, Mexican historians have been able to fix the date of the first conquest of the City of Mexico and follow it down to the advent of the Spanish Conquistadores.

What most concerns us, here, is to obtain such information as we may about the early history of the people conquered by Cortez. This is not such an easy matter, but we may learn some things of interest. Unfortunately, and to their discredit be it said, the conquerors, in a moment of mistaken zeal, destroyed the original and ancient city, with its monuments, statues of its pagan gods, its paintings on skins or on Maguay paper, made by the ancient Mexicans, and on which they preserved their history as we do ours, in books. What is left of these records may be said to form the foundation of what may be properly called the ancient history of Mexico. No one has, so far, been able to determine with certainty whence came the first inhabitants who settled in this country. The general opinion is that they came "from the North," but there are authorities who claim that the race which built towns in Yucatan, the ruins of which command admiration even to the present day, is much older and came "by way of the islands," which in remote times stretched along and almost united the northern coast of Asia with that of America. I have referred to these arguments in a former article.<sup>2</sup>

There are writers who claim that between Africa and America (a distance of over 3,000 miles) there were at one time, large and numerous islands, at short distances one from the other, and that by this route, there came colonists from Egypt, who settled in the province of Yucatan and founded a very powerful and civilized empire. The ruins and vestiges still to be seen there would seem to afford some

---

<sup>2</sup> *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, January, 1920.

foundation for this opinion. In many cases, we notice that the indigenous race that settled in Yucatan and Chiapas are of a civilization entirely different from that of the Mexicans<sup>3</sup> and of very remote antiquity.

Mention is made of a race known as the Toltecas (artificers or architects). These people were civilized and humane and had some knowledge of agriculture and the arts. In the year 607 they came from a very remote region (said to be the north), passed through Jalisco (Chimalhuacan), bordering on the Pacific, Zancatlan and Tollantzingo, finally arriving at Tollan (Tula), where they settled and built their capital. The Toltecan reign, according to Mexican historians, lasted 397 years, under nine kings, whose names and the period of whose reigns are given. The epoch is distinguished by civil wars, famines and plagues. These facts do not seem to bear out the statement of a writer in one of our prominent dailies, who in answer to "an anxious inquirer," says: "Toltecs is the name of a *traditional* and perhaps *mythical* race of Indians, said to have occupied the Mexican plateau during several centuries previous to the advent of the Aztecs."

They were succeeded by the Chichimeca, a barbarous people, who wore little or no clothing and who dwelt among the mountains in rude huts. They took possession of the land they found unoccupied and, in the course of time, became more civilized and established a monarchy ruled by fourteen kings, whose names and the period of whose reigns are also given. This monarchy lasted until the advent of the Spaniards. It is asserted that the Texcoco dynasty was founded by these people. The kingdom of Michoacan or Tarascos, which seems to have been founded by a Mexican family which later on became amalgamated and confounded with the Chichimecan tribes, succeeded in establishing a rich and powerful monarchy, more civilized, perhaps, than the Mexican. The exact date of its foundation is unknown, but it lasted until the arrival of the Spaniards, who conquered it after burning alive their last king, known as Caltzonzi, because he had no more gold to give them.

Historians tell us of a race of giants of "fierce and perverse" customs, which roamed over the country and committed many depredations upon the peaceful inhabitants, but, upon examination, we find that this narrative may be classed among the obscure traditions and fables which prevailed in many tribes. There is also mention of the Ulmecas, the Xicalancas, the Zapatecas, the Alcohuas, the Tepanecas and the Otomites, but it appears that many of these people were merely families of the same race, speaking

---

<sup>3</sup> The term "Mexicans," is applied to a people who arrived at Tula in 1175, at Tzompanco in 1216, and at Chapultepec in 1245.

the same language, with the exception of the Otomites, who are still in existence and whose language is unlike that of the Aztecs or Mexicans. Besides these there were many tribes which governed themselves independently and the conquest by the strongest of the weak caused the most bloody wars. Among the most prominent of these may be mentioned the republic of Traxcala (the land of corn and grain), founded by the Toltecas in the Sierra Mallalculé, governed by five caciques, until 1412, and, on the arrival of the Spaniards in this republic, they found it governed by a Senate composed of "ancients" and at war with the Mexican empire. The kingdoms of Acolhuacan, the republic of Huexotzin, that of Cholula governed by their priests, besides the three monarchies which had formed an alliance among themselves, known as the Tlacopan (Tacuba). Texcoco and the Mexican or Aztec empire, which, as stated above, was governed by Montezuma. All these monarchies and other smaller "señorías," whether independent or subject to the empire of Mexico, were destroyed by the conquerors.

The Mexicans, according to tradition, came from a distant country known as Azaltan, or the "land of the heron," and began a peregrination which lasted for two hundred and ninety-four years. During this time, they founded, as they went along, several cities in settlements, but continued their wanderings until they finally settled at Chapultepec (grasshopper hill) which then belonged to the king of Adzcapotzalco. Being pursued by various chiefs, their priests, who had quite an influence in their councils, were anxious to make a permanent settlement, and when they came to a suitable place on a *laguna* or lake where they saw an eagle perched on a cactus plant devouring a serpent,<sup>4</sup> they took it as a favorable omen, and believing it to be the will of their gods, they settled there, and called their new home after the name of the plant, Tenuch, whence is derived the name of the city of Tenoxtellan.

Other writers tell us that the word Mexico is derived from Meztin, the Moses who guided them in their wanderings; others again assure us that the name comes from Meztitli, a month or moon. The fact remains that the wanderers resolved to fix their permanent residence on the shores of the lake Texcoco. At this time they were very poor, they were hounded by all the tribes and families in their vicinity, while their only means of sustenance was such fish as the lake afforded, the result of the chase, when successful, and such roots as they were able to eat. They bore their privations with incredible resignation, but their valor was such as to make them feared and respected by the very tribes that hounded them. In the

---

<sup>4</sup> Sigüenza y Gongora, gives the date of the discovery of the cactus as July 18, 1327.



course of time they separated into two factions, the Tlaltelolcos, who occupied that part of the city which to-day extends from the parish of Santa Maria to the Penalvillo guard-house, and the Tenuchacas, or Mexicanos, who were the bravest and most indomitable who occupied Chapultepec as far as what is now known as the Ribera de San Cosmo. The lake occupied a large part of the area now covered by a number of the streets of the capital.

The city, as above stated, was then called Tenoxtilan, and the country, all that portion included in the empire was known as Anáhuac, which means "near the water." The country at that time was very extensive, but the greater part was, as yet, unexplored. It extended southwest and south to the Pacific Ocean; southeast to Central America, and to the north it reached the vast wilderness of what is now known as Sonora, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Upper California. The region known as Anáhuac comprised the sovereignties of Michoacan, Tlacapan and Texcoco, and with the Huastecas, Chichimecas and the domain of the Mexican emperors, included many other peoples conquered by their arms, in all it is calculated as 16,000 square leagues. It is true that the oldest history of the tribes that settled on the central plateau of Anáhuac is uncertain, vague and perhaps, to a certain extent, fabulous. There is not a single approximate geographical statement that indicates where the kingdom of Huehuetlapatlan, a Chichimecan sovereignty, existed. The first kings, thirteen in number, and whose names are given, cover a period of over two thousand years, so they say. In 719-720 Icoatzin founded the Toltecan dynasty, giving his son full authority, and then follows a series of nine kings (names and dates given) which extends from 720 to 1103. Of the events of these reigns we know little except that pulque was discovered in 1042, in the reign of Tepancaltzin, the eighth ruler of this dynasty, which might lead us to suppose that the doctrine of prohibition was as yet unknown. Between 1103 and 1120 the country appears to have passed through a period of disastrous anarchy.

A word about the Aztec monarchy. It began at Tlaltelalco, and had a series of twelve kings. The last of these, Moquihuix, invaded Mexico, but was vanquished by the Mexicans under Axayacatl, and from that time the two monarchies of Tlalteloco and Chapultepec became united in one single government. The Mexican monarchy, accordingly, may be said to date from 1438. Some Mexican historians give Acamapictli as the first ruler, but, according to the various dates before us, we must begin to count the line of kings of the Mexican tribes from the time of their arrival at the Anáhuac plateau. This would give us Huetzilihuetli, the son of a noble Mexican lady,

the wife of Ilhuicatl, lord of Tzimparago, where the Mexicans spent seven years before their advent at Chapultepec. This chief was recognized as king and from him descended all the emperors of Mexico.

The Mexicans, before settling finally on the shores of the lake, made incursions into the adjacent regions. They next formed an alliance with Acamapictli and declared war against Cocox, king of Culhuacan, in 1301. Huitzilhuictl died in 1318. The second king was Xintemoc, in whose reign the empire was divided, part of his subjects going to Ixtacalco (white house) and the other going to Xaltelolco (sandy soil). The third king, Acomapictli, was ruler of Culhuacan. He ascended the throne in 1352. The sons of Quinatzin, king of Texcoco revolted against their father, who appealed to the Mexican monarch for help. The latter rallied a large force, routed the rebels and pacified the country. He reigned for forty-one years in peace, feared and respected by his neighbors, and from this time may be said to begin the recognition of the valor and superiority of the Mexicans, who for the previous fifteen years had been regarded with contempt. This king died in 1402 and was succeeded by Huitzilhuictl, his eldest son.

It was the custom, in those days, that when the throne became vacant by the death of the king, the priests made every effort to get control of the government, and it often happened that they placed obstacles in the way of the new king's accession, and on this occasion they caused an interregnum of a year. During this time many tribes arrived from Michuacan, Jalisco and a northern province then known as Cibola. These new colonists from Toltecan were known as Mexicas, Tepinecas, Culhuaques and Huitzinauques. Some were admittel at Chapultepec and others at Culhuacan and at Atzapotzalco. The king died in 1414 and was buried at Chapultepec. Chimalpopoca, brother of Huitzilhuictl, succeeded as fifth king, and it appears that from this time began, as we have indicated in a former article, the custom of electing the brother of the deceased king as his successor. In default of a brother, a nephew was elected. This prevented the eldest son or any other who might be unworthy from succeeding to the throne by right of primogeniture or other rights. The electors were selected from the body of the nobility (and included the suffrages of the entire nation), and their electoral power terminated with the first election.

The only recorded acts in the life of the new sovereign are that his reign began most auspiciously, that he married the beautiful Matlalatzin, daughter of the lord of Tlatelolco, but, wearied by the tyranny of Maxtla, king of Atzapotzalco, he joined his brother in a conspiracy, which being discovered, the tyrant Maxtla stabbed his

own brother to death, and ordered Chimalpopoca to be confined in a cage, where he died of starvation within a few days. These events took place in 1427. The sixth king of Mexico was Ixcohuatl, the natural brother of Chimalpopoca. This selection was not pleasing to the tyrant Maxtla, and the kings of Tlaltelcolco and Chapultepec formed an alliance and declared war. Netzahualcoyotl, king of Texcoco, joined the Tlascaltecas, and, in less than fifteen days, conquered several cities, subjugated and punished many rebellious villages and entered the capital of Texcoco in triumph.

The Mexicans and Tlaltellocos who aided in this war with Netzahualcoyotl, king of Texcoco, found themselves closely besieged until finally, after surmounting many difficulties, the king of Texcoco collected an army of 150,000 men, which he led into Mexico. After an assault of many days Maxtla was completely routed and was killed in combat with Netzahualcoyotl, who succeeded in pacifying his dominions and restored the nobles on their estates and made them tributaries to Texcoco. By this new arrangement the señorias of Xechimilcos, Mexicoas, Tenayocan and Quahuahuac were annexed to Mexico. These events occurred during the reign of the sixth king of Mexico, who is described by his people as "adorned with virtues that gave promise to his nation." He died in 1436. His successor Montezuma I., nephew of Ixcohuatl, was a valiant and warlike prince. As soon as he was firmly settled upon the throne, he passed over the reins of government to the Senate, and began a series of victorious campaigns, especially against the Chalcas, who had basely murdered the sons of the king of Texcoco. In the tenth year of his reign, he devoted himself to the alleviation of the miseries of his subjects caused by floods and the scarcity of cereals. The war was continued, however, by two famous generals who distinguished themselves in the field in their younger days. They were Atempancoatl and Cihuacuatl, who also acted as private advisers of the emperor, and they exercised great influence over the public affairs of the government. The little empire of Chapultepec, during this reign, attained the highest point of its splendor, for it had conquered remote and warlike peoples and extended its dominions as far as Huasteca Orizava, the Gulf Coast and Oaxaca, and on the south to a large part of what now known as Terras Calientes. Montezuma I. also completed the erection of a great temple, beautified the city and enacted wise and beneficent laws. He was succeeded by Axayacatl, who, following the custom of monarchs on assuming supreme power, sacrificed a large number of prisoners of war. It will be remembered that the Mexican tribes were more anxious, in times of war to take prisoners than to kill their enemies. These prisoners were reserved for sacrifices on great state occasions.



The new king undertook the conquest of Tehuantepec and the subjugation of the entire country as far as Huatulco. The Tlaltelolcans, governed by other "señorías" began to harass the Mexicans, but were soon subdued, their king, Morquihuix, was killed and Tlaltelolco was thenceforward made subject to Mexico. The most important event of this reign was the fusion of the two monarchies into one, as already stated. The king continued his campaign against his neighbors, but he did not live to enjoy the fruit of his conquests. He died in 1477.

War seems to have been the favorite occupation of the Mexican rulers, and this appears to continue to the present day. No sooner did Tizoc, brother of the deceased emperor, come into power than he began a series of campaigns, but before he could realize his ambitious aspirations he died from the effects of poison after a brief reign of four years. His brother, Ahuizotl, succeeded him and continued his brother's campaigns, keeping all the prisoners captured that he might sacrifice them at the dedication of a temple to the god of war. Ancient historians tell us that this ceremony took place in 1486 and that 60,000 victims were sacrificed in four days. It may be on this account that in Mexico we meet with the common expression: "He is an Ahuiztate," in speaking of an evil-minded person. Another important event in his reign was the campaign he made against Guatemala, which resulted in the conquest of that country. He died in 1502.

The next king was Montezuma II., son of the terrible Axayacotl. He gratified his belligerent propensities in a series of campaigns and expeditions against his weaker neighbors, but he did not meet with the success he expected. His troops were routed and his son fell wounded on the field of Tlascalhuapan. He later on renewed the war on Guatemala and captured a large number of prisoners, who were sacrificed at the dedication of the Temple of the Sun. Some of his provinces revolted against him, but they were soon subjugated and punished severely for their temerity.

In 1518, Juan de Grijalva, a Spanish chieftain, appeared on the Gulf Coast. Montezuma, when informed of the details of this expedition, was filled with the greatest anxiety regarding the fate of his empire, and these fears were increased by a series of natural phenomena. Earthquakes and hurricanes devastated the valley of Mexico. The principal temple caught fire suddenly and a great comet appeared in the heavens. Added to this a tradition to the effect that the "children of the sun were to come from the East," struck terror to the hearts of Montezuma, and his people, and this alarm was intensified when it was learned that Cortez had landed at Vera Cruz on Good Friday, 1519.

Montezuma's first impulse was to march against the invaders with a large army, but dominated by deep superstition he did not dare to carry out his intention at once. He sued for peace, sending valuable presents by two ambassadors, members of his own family. Cortez advanced as far as Comportellas and effected an alliance with the Totonacos, who had grown weary of the despotism of the Mexicans. Shortly after this he decided to go to Mexico City and with his army reached the central plateau of the Cordilleras.

The history of Mexico from the time of the conquest until the present day is too well known, in all its various aspects, to every student of American history, and as it is not the purpose of this paper to deal with its modern history, it will be enough for us to add that ten emperors reigned (?) after Montezuma II. Citlauhazin and Cuahutemoc both reigned in 1520. With the fall of the capital and the tragic death of the last named emperor, in 1520, the Aztec empire ceased to exist.

Let us take a cursory glance at some of the other kingdoms. Texcoco, according to the information afforded by the most reliable historians, originated with the Chichimecas, who, under the guidance of a chief known as Xolotl, took possession of a section of country inhabited by a few Toltecan families. Other tribes known as Aculhuas, Tecpanecas and Otomites came down from the north. The Chichimecan ruler, far from treating them in a hostile manner, received these colonists with kindness, and he established himself at Texcoco, where he built a temple to the Sun. He also built palaces surrounded by beautiful gardens and gave new lustre and importance of the old town once the home of the Toltecas. His son Napaletzin, deserves to have been regarded as the most renowned monarch of his time, on account of the wise laws he enacted. He forbade the burning and destruction of forest trees, the robbing of a neighbor's traps, the appropriation of game wounded by another hunter and hunting without a lawful permit. He inflicted capital punishment on adulterers, and on all who destroyed "signboards" on the boundaries of estates or those indicating the way to wayfarers. His reign of thirty-two years was distinguished from that of other rulers by the absence of wars. It was a peaceful and beneficent reign. This ruler died at an advanced age in 1263.

Napaletzin was succeeded by his eldest son, Huitzin-Pocholt, to whom the Mexican historian, Veytia, gives the name of Tloltzin. He was noted for the encouragement he gave to agriculture and for the development and prosperity of his kingdom in his day; a prosperity which continued until the advent of the Spanish conquistadores. We may add that it was during the reign

of this prince that attention was given to the cultivation of corn, beans, sage, a variety of flowers and especially of cotton.

During the following reign, that of Quinatzin, the eldest son of the former king, who began to reign in 1298, occurred the advent of the Mexicans, who, as already related, settled at Chapultepec, on the shores of the lake known as the Texcoco, and more than twice the dimensions it has now. On the death of Quinatzin, in 1357, he was succeeded by his youngest son, Techotlalatzin. From this time on, the dynasty became united with the monarchy of Tlaltelolco and Chapultepec for the purpose of making war on their neighbors, and to defend themselves against aggressors, and these three monarchies, with that of Tacuba, which was of the Mexican race, became supreme and ruled over all the others and eventually excelled them in wealth and civilization.

The Chichimecan monarchy was in reality interrupted by the usurpation of Tezozomoc and Maxtla, both ambitious and ferocious men who richly deserved the name of tyrants, and the restoration of that dynasty was effected by Netzahualcoyotl. This prince, the ninth of his line, was a young man full of wisdom and benevolence and greatly beloved by his people. Maxtla, envious of his popularity and anxious to seize his dominions, lost no opportunity to annoy him, and even went so far as to hire assassins to murder him in his own palace at Texcoco, but he managed to elude them and sought refuge in the mountains of Tlaxcala, where he dwelt for a long time in caves and huts, going out only at night in search of food.

The enraged Maxtla put a price upon his head and offered large rewards for his capture dead or alive, but the affection in which he was held by all classes of people protected him against his enemies, and, far from betraying him they shielded him from his pursuers. This lasted for a long time, until, at last, the States becoming tired of the insolence and despotism of Maxtla, they formed a league, raised an army, and, one day, Netzahualcoyotl appeared at a place agreed upon and took command of a large army that had been raised for his support. After a series of bloody battles he completely routed the tyrant, took him prisoner, put him to death, razed the city of Atzapoltzalco, which became a mere slave market, and entered the capital of Texcoco in triumph.

Several of the lords of Texcoco, Xochimilco, Acolman and elsewhere, who had formerly been partisans and dependents of Maxtla, raised the standard of rebellion against Netzahualcoyotl, but were soon subdued. All the cities were compelled to obedience, and the king, having founded the Tacuba empire, was crowned Emperor of Texcoco.

No sooner had the new emperor established peace in his domin-



ions, than he set to work to govern his people wisely. He pardoned all his enemies, restored their confiscated estates to the nobility, formed eight tributary provinces, established tribunals of justice and an Imperial Court, with residence at Texcoco. In addition to this he founded an Academy of Sciences and a War Department, systematized the collection of taxes and gave his people many other wise laws. He built sumptuous palaces and improved and beautified all the provinces of his empire, especially at Texcoco, his favorite residence. In a word, he was a valiant, wise and just sovereign, and a philosopher, who like Socrates of old, reached a knowledge of the God of the Universe and of the justice and mercy of the Divinity, in spite of the customs and barbarous religious rites of his times. If we study the history of the ancient religions, from the time of Moses to the Christian era, and even later, we shall find that all races, in spite of their gross idolatry and polytheistic tendencies, recognized a Supreme Divinity "above all gods." It was so with Netzahualcoyotl. He died, mourned, not only by his subjects, but by his royal allies whom he had aided by his strong arm and his great wisdom. He was a ruler worthy of imitation, and history records the names of few like him even in civilized times.

The virtues of the late king were inherited by his youngest son, Netzahualpitli, the tenth monarch of his line. His brothers rebelled against him, but were soon subdued. Peace being restored, the new king reigned after the manner of his father. He spent his last days in retirement and died in 1516, leaving four sons, one of whom, Cacamatzin, the eldest, ascended the throne. Ixtliloxochitl opposed him and went to assail him with a formidable army, but the brothers came to an understanding, bloodshed was averted and the eldest continued to reign while the other returned to the mountains with his army and proceeded to harass the Mexicans. It was just at this time that Cortez landed with his troops at Vera Cruz.

\* \* \* \* \*

Another of the sons of Netzahualpitli, named Coanacotzin, a young man full of patriotism and valor, declared against the Spaniards, fought by the side of Cuahuhtemoc during the siege and was taken prisoner at the Lake. He was compelled by Cortez to accompany him on his expedition to the Hibueras and was finally hanged by his cruel captors.

Ixtlilxochitl, the fourteenth and last of the Tenayucan or Texcoco monarchs, became the most bitter enemy of his own country, and even of his own brothers. He raised an army and aided Cortez in all his expeditions, fighting by his side during the siege of Mexico, his men taking most active part in the destruction of the city and in the horrible massacres that followed. After the fall of the capital and

a succession of conquests in the adjacent country. Ixtlilxochitl seems to have undergone a change of heart. We are told that he became a Christian and was baptized by Father Martin de Valencia, and was given the name of Don Fernando. Subsequent to this he became engaged in some campaigns in Huasteca, Panuco and elsewhere and finally accompanied Cortez on his celebrated expedition to Las Hibueras. On his return to the capital he undertook the erection of the convent of San Francisco, and at the same time, with a hod upon his shoulders, carried the stones and directed its construction at the corner of what is now known as the junction of Santa Brigida and San Francisco streets, thus setting an example to his pagan subjects, who did the greatest part of the work in the rebuilding of the city. Let us hope that his conversion was sincere.<sup>5</sup> With the death of this monarch the Texcocan dynasty founded by Xolotl the Great, in 1120, went out of existence.

The kingdom of Michoacan (the land of fishes) was far more extensive than that of Texcoco and was in existence for some two hundred and fifty years. Most of its history is a record of wars and conquests. Among its rulers was Texiacuri, who in his childhood was kept hidden away in the Temple by the priests and trained in the arts of war. In due time he was proclaimed king, took command of the army and waged relentless war upon his neighbors. He conquered various "señorías," and unified all his conquests into the kingdom of Michoacan.

Another ruler was Zovango, or Sihuangá, who encouraged agriculture, gained many victories in war and completed the celebrated walls of Michoacan. After a "glorious and comparatively peaceful" reign he died about the year 1500. His successor was a contemporary of Montezuma, and shared the horrible fate meted out by the conquistadores to the Mexican rulers.

The Mexican historian, Don Manuel Payno, to whom I am indebted for much of the information contained in this paper, tells us that a cruel and bloodthirsty "chief" who went to Mexico as President of the Audiencia (a judicial office) took command of the government and, desirous of "stealing all he could lay his hands on," called together the "caciques" and ordered them to bring him all the gold in their possession. The king of Michoacan, who was among them, told him that Olid, a Spaniard, had carried off all the treasures they possessed. Nevertheless he brought the little he had left, together with some gold. Nuño de Guzman not satisfied with this, and believing the unfortunate sovereign still had large quantities of gold

---

<sup>5</sup> Don Fernando Alva Ixtlilxochitl, made a course at the University of Santa Cruz, and wrote the "*Historia de los Chichimecas*," a very reliable work.

hidden away, ordered him thrown into prison, where he lingered for six months, after which his captor took him with him on an expedition to Jalisco. On the way he trumped up a false charge against his victim and ordered him to be burned alive in the year 1525. This was the end of the ancient Mexican monarchy.

\* \* \* \* \*

We have dwelt, thus far, upon the history of dynasties and wars in a detail which may strike the reader as somewhat monotonous, but our object in doing so has been to show by actual facts that *all* the history of ancient Mexico is not *fabulous* nor *mythical*, and all the facts we have given are easily accessible to any one who will take the trouble to make honest research. Let us now turn from battlefields and bloodshed and glance at the home life of the ancient Mexican. Aside from the odious and barbarous sacrifices practiced by the ancient Mexicans, there is much in their domestic life, in their manners and customs that is worthy of admiration and that will stand the glare of the light of this boasted twentieth century. Let us, in the first place, take a glance at the language and dialects.

The language spoken by the civilized tribes that settled the central mesa, or plateau, was the Nahuatl, which is the proper name of the Azteca. In a general way the word Nahuatl, among the common people, meant a "wizard" or "sorcerer." But the word has a variety of meanings, such as "he who knows everything," learned, expert, civilized. For this reason, doubtless, the richest, most expressive and most regular of all the languages known at that time was called the Nagual, and it was eventually adopted by all the people of Anáhuac. We may add that a number of derivations from the root, "na," all contain the idea of the "known," or "knowledge." The early Spanish missionaries to New Spain speak of the nahuatl (plural of nahuatlín) as masters of mystic knowledge. dealers in black art, wizards and sorcerers.<sup>6</sup> This, though not the only one, was the general language, and, if as some authors assert, the Xucalancas and the Ulmecas were the first to people Yucatan, it will be remembered that they spoke the Maya. The purest Nahuatl was spoken in the Texcocoan and in the Mexican court, and was what is known to-day as the Aztec or Mexican. Professor Ferdinand Starr tells us that there is a very large number (running into the hundreds of thousands) of pure blood Indians who speak the Aztec language.

It will be impossible for us here to refer to the many languages and dialects spoken by the ancient Mexicans. This subject alone

<sup>6</sup> "Nagualism." a Study in Native American Folk-Lore and History, by Daniel G. Brinton, A. M., M. D., LL. D., D. S. Dr. Brinton was a college-mate of mine, and shortly before his death we made a careful examination of this subject.



would afford interesting matter for a series of papers. Philologists have entertained various opinions as to the difficulty of rendering and translating them. For instance, Remesol, speaking of the Mixtic (a people who inhabited the territory now within the states of Guerrero, Puebla and Oaxaca), says: "Es una lengua dificultosa de sabers e por la gran equivocacion de los bocables (vocables, terms) para cuya distincion es necesario usar, de ordinario, del sonido de la nariz y aspiracion del aliento." Burgoa shares the same opinion, for he complains that it is a "lengua dificultotissima en la pronunciacion, con notables variedades de terminos y voces en unos y otros pueblos." In contra, the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg, in his "Sequises," says: La langue Zapoteca est d'une doiceur et de une soïote qui rapelle l'Italien." The anonymous "Vocabularios Castellano-Zapoteca" does not agree with the good Abbé, for it says that "por la ortografia y por muchas palabras y frasis, personas inteligentes juzgan que presentan un lenguaje bastarto, alterado y a.<sup>7</sup> Evidently philologists will find here a wide field for reëxamination.

An idea of the difficulties the early missionaries must have encountered from the variety of languages and the derivations of the words may be gleaned from the following: In the Mixtic language the word "father" is rendered by dzelax, or xidihi; in Zapoteca it is xinaagaxana. The word "nose," in Mixtic is dzitu, in Zapoteca it is simply xi; the word "head" in Mixtic is dzini; in Zapoteca it is icqui. Of course, these words must be pronounced according to Spanish pronunciation.

According to the careful researches of Don Orozco y Barra, we find that at the time of Montezuma II. the following languages were spoken: the Maya, in Yucatan, and in a part of Tabasco; the Huesteca in the province of Panuco (now Tamaulipas); the Tarascan in the kingdom of Michoacan; the Otomi, in what was then known as the independent kingdom of Toluca, now in the State of Mexico; the Zapoteca on the isthmus of Tehuantepec and in a part of the kingdom of Oaxaca, now the State of Oaxaca; the Mexican in the central plateau, and along the southern coast to the banks of the Rio Grande de Tolololan and along the Gulf to Central America. There were some other languages, but philologists tell us that they were only dialects.

We may be permitted here, before dwelling upon the beauties and scope of the Indian languages, to call attention to the fact that when Christianity was first introduced into the country, the Padres were sorely troubled (as we have shown in former articles) as to how to express themselves to their neophytes. They had to learn a series

---

<sup>7</sup> "Indian Languages in Mexico and Central America." Washington, Government Press.

of languages which had never been reduced to writing, as we understand the word "writing"; which had no alphabet, no grammar and nothing but sounds or symbols to give expression to language. Thus, when the "Pater Noster" was reduced to writing, the Padre sought the symbol which expressed the sound nearest to the syllables pa-ter. He found that a "flag" stood for the sound pantli, and a "rock" stood for the sound tetl. Pater was, therefore, represented, pictorially, by a flag and a rock. We cannot tell whether it was sounded as pnatelt or only as panate, the nearest possible equivalent in the Mexican language, which has no "r." Similarly noster was phonetically represented by noch-tetl, pictorially by the Indian "fig," noch-tli and the rock, as above. Here we have the application of symbols to denote sounds without regard to the original sense. This was a rather slow and difficult method of teaching reading and it was soon abandoned once the Indians had learned the alphabet of the missionaries.

We cannot fail to notice here how the first conception of phonetics was gained; the first step, in fact, from hieroglyphics to writing. Speaking of Mexican Pictorial Writing,<sup>8</sup> those who have seen it pronounce it really wonderful. It is thought that the art of representing historical events, in this manner was invented by the Toltecas, be this as it may it is beyond question that it is by this means—picture writing—that the early history of Mexico has been preserved, and it is to be regretted that so many of these "picture-records" were destroyed by the Spaniards before they realized what they really were. Apart from the difficulties encountered in studying the ancient Mexican languages all authorities agree that they

---

<sup>8</sup> As soon as the clamor of arms ceased and the preaching of the Gospel became possible, some of the "Padres," seeing how necessary it was for them (if they hoped to succeed in converting the natives) to have a knowledge of their manners and customs, and also, no doubt, moved by a desire to learn something of the ancient history of the people, set to work to acquire this information. They discovered that the Aztecas preserved the record of past events by means of "songs and hieroglyphic pictures," many of which were missing, for various reasons. They succeeded in inducing the natives to show them what they had remaining, and they made further records from the traditions still preserved by the people and handed down from generation to generation, accepting only those that seemed beyond all question. They questioned the old men, compared their statements and accepted only such as seemed to be "de mayur verosimilitud."

Father Tuvor, a Texcocan, at the instance of Viceroy Enríquez made a collection of the "picture paintings" of Texcoco and Tula, had them interpreted by such of the old men as were competent to do so, and who could be relied upon, and from their interpretations was able to gather much of the history of the ancient Mexicans. These researches were published (and republished in 1878) under the title of "Códice Ramirez." Father Duran, a native Mexican and probably a "meztizo," revised this "Códice," made numerous additions to it and republished it under the title of "Historia de las Indias de Nueva España."

Intilixochitl's book on his native city of Texcoco, is a mass of exaggerations put together without order and utterly unreliable. The work of Punar, his contemporary, is fully reliable.

were copious, regular and that they abounded in beautiful figures of speech and gave ample play to the orator and poet. The youth who manifested a talent for oratory was instructed, at an early age, in the use of language. In their poetry, the Mexicans observed the laws of cadence and measure; the language was brilliant and agreeable; figurative and embellished with frequent comparisons to the most pleasing objects in nature, such as flowers, trees, rivers, etc. They were children of nature and nature appealed to them. The subjects were not restricted, but consisted of hymns of praise, petition and thanksgiving to their deities, historical poems, reciting the glories of the nation and sung at popular and profane dances. Some, again, were odes containing moral lessons; some were love songs, while others treated of the chase and kindred subjects. The priests were the chief poets, but many highly meritorious compositions were written by King Nazahualcoyotl. It is said that he composed sixty hymns in honor of "the Creator of Heaven." In one of his poems he lamented the fall of the tyrant Tezozomoc, whom he compared to a large and stately tree, which had extended its roots through many countries, and spread the shade of its branches over all the empires, but which, at last, worm-eaten and wasted, fell to the earth never to regain its youthful verdure. The poem opens with these words: "O King, unstable and restless, when thou art dead, then will thy people be overthrown; thy place shall be no more; the Creator—the All-powerful—alone shall reign." The ending of the poem is no less touching: "Let the joyous birds sing on and rejoice in the beauty of spring and let the butterflies enjoy the honey and fragrance of the flowers, for life is a tender plant that is soon plucked and withers away." His "Song on the Mutability of Life" is too long to be inserted here.

Dramatic and lyric poetry were in great repute among the ancient Mexicans. Their theatres, like those of the Greeks and Romans, were uncovered. The Chevalier Boturini tells us that their comedies were excellent, and that "among the antiques he had in his museum were two dramatic compositions of great merit." Acosta gives a description of a play at Cholula, during a feast given in honor of the god Quatzalcoatl, which was "very suggestive of the early scenes among the Greeks," and it is probable that had the Mexican Empire lasted a century or two longer the theatre would have improved by slow degrees as did the theatres of the Greeks.

On the question of religion of the ancient Mexicans authorities are not all of one mind. Clavigero, S. J., tells us that in the year 609 the Toltecas assembled "all the wise men, the prophets and astrologers" and painted a famous book which they called Teomox-



tli, or Divine Book. In this same volume was represented the origin of the Indians, the Confusion of Tongues at the building of the Tower of Babel, the eclipse of the sun that occurred at the death of Christ, as well as the prophecies concerning the future of the empire. Another authority tells us that the Mexicans worshiped a Supreme Being, "invisible and unchangeable," whom they called Teotl, or God. Him they feared, though they recognized Him as the friend of mankind.

The great enemy of man they considered to be an evil spirit whom they called Tlacultecocolotl, or the "Rational One." Unlike the Greeks, who regarded the owl as the symbol of wisdom, the Mexicans made it the symbol of dark deeds. They believed in the immortality of the soul. Soldiers slain in battle or who perished in captivity and the spirits of women who died in childbirth went, at once, to the "heaven of the Sun," who was regarded as the "Prince of Glory." Here they enjoyed an existence of endless delights, where every day, at the first appearance of the Sun's rays they hailed his birth with rejoicings and dancing and with the music of "instruments and voices." They attended their deity to his meridian, where it "meets the souls of the women," and, with the same festivities, accompanied him to his setting. The souls of the wicked go to a place of utter darkness, called Mecatlan, a sort of hell, where it seems they undergo no other punishment than that of being deprived of light. The Mexicans prayed upon their knees, with their faces towards the east. They also performed fasts, penances and sacrifices. In the first ages they believed that things necessary and useful for sustaining human life were really deities and they represented them by hieroglyphics.

The people preserve the memory of Quetzalcoatl, whom tradition tells us "had a white face, a close beard and wore a long tunic. He taught the Mexicans agriculture and the arts (trades), gave them wise counsels, and then disappeared in a mysterious manner. He must not be confounded with the god of air, who bore the same name. This brings to my mind an account which I read years ago, to the effect that when this continent of ours first became known to the people of the Old World, a band of Christian missionaries from China came over with the first adventurers. They were not Chinese, of course, but Europeans who had been laboring in China, and who now saw a new field for their work of evangelization. They labored among the Mexicans for many years, and died off, one by one. Their superior, who was greatly beloved and revered by the people, after his earthly career was over, "mysteriously disappeared," that is, died among the mountains where he sought refuge from the

hostility of invading tribes. He had a white face, wore a close beard and wore a long tunic (habit). His memory was long cherished by the people of his day, and by their immediate descendants, and, in time, long after his mysterious disappearance, his memory survived. Younger generations, who had heard of his great work, but who had themselves, for want of Christian guides, drifted back into paganism, carved a new idol and fashioned its face, as nearly as they could imagine it to have been from the description given by their fathers, was made to resemble that of the "mysterious man" who had taught them so many useful things. Could this have been Quetzalcocotl?<sup>9</sup> I give the story as I remember it. May not this, too, in a measure, account for the apparent mixture of Christian and pagan rites in the religion of the Mexicans?

Polygamy, though permissible in some tribes to kings and nobles, only one of the wives was considered as legitimate; the practice of polygamy was as a general thing looked upon with disfavor. Among the middle and lower classes conjugal fidelity was held in high esteem. We have already adverted to the surprise of the "Padres" at the similarity of many of the religious rites of the ancient Mexicans to those of the Christians. Here is a striking instance:

When a child was born, the nurse, after giving it the first necessary attention, washed it, saying these words (evidently a formula belonging to her calling): "Receive this water, for the goddess Chalchiuhcueje is thy mother. May this bath cleanse the spots which thou bearest from the womb of thy mother, may it purify thy heart and give thee good and perfect life." Then taking the water again with her hand, she breathed upon it, and anointed the mouth, forehead and breast of the child with it, and after laving the whole of the body, she said: "May the invisible God descend upon this water and cleanse thee of every sin of impurity and deliver thee from misfortune." Then, addressing the child, she said: "Lovely child, the gods (Ometeuctli and Omecihuatl) have created thee in the highest place in the heavens that they might send thee into this world; but know that the life upon which thou art entering is sad, painful and full of trials and miseries; nor wilt thou be able to eat thy bread without labor. May God assist thee in the many adversities which await thee." This ceremony was followed by congratulations to the parents.

The advice of parents to their children on reaching maturity would do credit to the most enlightened Christian parents of to-day. For

<sup>9</sup> Quetzalcocotl, is the Fisher-Serpent. The name is formed from the words "Quetzal," a bird of beautiful plumage found in Southern Mexico, and "coatl," a serpent—also known as the Pluma serpent.

instance, the father would address his son on attaining his majority as follows: "My beloved son, lay to heart the words I am going to utter, for they are from our forefathers, who admonished us to keep them locked up like precious golden leaves, and taught us what boys and girls are beloved of the Lord. For this reason the men of old devoted to His service held children in great reverence. They roused them out of their sleep, undressed them, bathed them in cold water, made them sweep the temples and offer copra to the gods. They washed their mouths, saying that God heard their prayers and accepted their offerings, their tears and their sorrows because they were of a pure heart and without blemish. Go not where thou art not called, nor interfere with that which does not concern thee. In conversations do not lay thy hands upon another, nor speak too much, or interrupt another's discourse. . . . When thou art at table do not eat voraciously nor show thy displeasure if anything displeases thee. . . . If thou become rich, do not grow insolent nor scorn the poor, lest the very gods who deny riches to others in order to give them to thee, offended at thy pride, will take from thee to give to them. Never tell a falsehood, because a lie is a heinous sin. Speak ill of no man. Be not dissolute, because thereby thou wilt incense the gods and they will cover thee with infamy. Steal not nor yield thyself up to gaming, otherwise thou wilt be a disgrace to thy parents whom thou oughtest rather to honor for the training they have given thee. If thou wilt be virtuous thy example will put the wicked to shame.

"No more, my son, enough has been said in discharge of my duties as a father. With these counsels I would fortify thy mind. Refuse them not nor act in contradiction to them, for on them thy life and all thy happiness depend." We can hardly realize that this is not the language of a Christian father to his son, and that it is simply the advice of a pagan father.

The Mexican mother's advice to her daughter is such that a mother, in this boasted, enlightened, twentieth century, would hardly dare to give her daughter, if she were capable of giving it. The daughters are wiser in this generation (or they think they are) than their old-fashioned mothers. But let us see what a pagan mother five hundred years ago, felt it her duty to say to her daughter: "My beloved daughter, I have tried to bring thee up with the greatest possible care and thy father has cherished and polished thee as a priceless emerald that thou mayest appear in the eyes of men as a jewel of virtue. Strive always to be good, for otherwise who will have thee for a wife? Then wilt thou be rejected by every one. Life is a thorny, laborious path and it is necessary to exert all our powers to obtain the means to obtain the goods (blessings) that the



gods are willing to bestow upon us. We must not, therefore, be lazy or negligent, but diligent in everything. Be orderly and take pains to manage the economy of thy house. Wherever thou goest, go with modesty and composure, without hurrying thy steps or laughing loudly with those whom thou meetest, nor cast thine eyes carelessly to one side or the other. Employ thyself diligently in spinning and weaving, in sewing and embroidering as by doing this thou wilt gain esteem and respect.

"In whatever thou doest encourage not evil thoughts, but attend solely to the service of the gods and the giving of comfort to thy parents. If thy father or thy mother call thee, do not be called twice, but go instantly to know their pleasure. Keep not company with dissolute, lying or vile women, lest they infallibly infect thee by their example. Attend upon thy family and do not go on slight occasion out of the house, nor be seen wandering through the streets or in the market place; for in such places thou wilt meet with thy ruin. Remember that vice, like a poisonous herb, brings death to those who touch it, and when it once lodges in the mind it is hard to dislodge it. Enter not, without some urgent motive, into another's house, that nothing may be either said or thought, injurious to thy honor, but, if thou enterest into the house of thy relatives, salute them with respect, and do not remain idle, but immediately take up a spindle, or do any useful thing thou seest to do.

"When thou art married, respect thy husband and obey him and diligently do what he commands thee. Avoid incurring his displeasure nor show thyself irritable nor ill-tempered, but receive him kindly, even if he is poor and lives at thy expense; if he occasions thee any unpleasantness let him not know thy displeasure, at the time; but later on, tell him with gentleness what vexed thee, that he may be won by thy mildness and offend no further. Accept, my daughter, the counsel that I give thee. I am already advanced in years, and have had sufficient experience in dealing with the world. I am thy mother; I wish that thou mightest live well. Fix my precepts in thy heart, for then thou wilt be helped, so that if by not listening to me, or neglecting to heed my instructions any misfortune shalt befall thee, the fault will be thine alone and the consequences thereof. Enough, my child, may the gods prosper thee."

We need not comment upon the words of this dutiful mother. Setting aside the minor references to customs peculiar to the country, the times and the gods, what better counsel could even a Christian mother give a beloved daughter than that given by this pagan mother? How would the Christian daughter of our day receive it?

A word about the training of children. Early in life they were taught useful lessons in modesty, religion, respect for parents,

superiors and the aged, as well as in industry. At five years of age they were either delivered to the priests to be educated or their education began at home. Mexican paintings show the various steps taken in the training of children. One goes to war with his father to learn the use of arms and to be courageous; another is represented with a small pack on his back going to market with his father. The little girls are early taught to spin and weave. They abhor a lie and a child guilty of this vice has its lips pricked with thorns of the aloes. If it persists in lying its lips are slightly split. Girls are instructed to remain in the house, and if inclined to run the streets their feet are tied together. Mexican fathers were not given to "spare the rod and spoil the child," as refractory boys soon learned to their sorrow. We saw the painting of a "naughty boy," bound hand and foot, and of a willful girl made to rise at night and sweep the floor. Children were not, as in our day, permitted to rule the house, nor were they allowed to listen to the conversation of their elders and to interrupt or give their opinions.

Schools were established for children of both sexes, but the sexes were kept apart. There was no such thing as co-education, and the boys and girls were hardly allowed to speak to one another. In the college both sexes received chiefly religious instruction. It was reserved for the enlightened twentieth century to banish God from education. Mexican children were taught to sweep the temple; to gather wood for the sacrifices; to replenish the censers and to fear and reverence the gods. The girls who attended the seminaries were generally the daughters of nobles and priests. They were strictly guarded and watched by vestal priestesses. There were no evening serenades or moonlight rambles; no auto rides, no "movies" for the young ladies, and if a girl was detected looking at a young man she was severely punished, and if she presumed to go out walking with him, her feet were tied together and pricked with thorns. Death, even, was the penalty for infraction of some of the rules. The girls were required to bathe frequently and to give much attention to personal cleanliness and to be skillful and tidy in domestic affairs. Both sexes were taught to hold their tongues in the presence of their elders, to answer them with reverence and to be modest in their behavior. Yet these people were called barbarians and the parents and teachers of our day are called enlightened!

The Toltecas were very solicitous about the education of their children. Texcoco preserved relics of art in which the broad principles laid down by their forefathers were, doubtless, remembered. Among the various sumptuous edifices at Utatlan was the college, having a faculty of seventy professors and an attendance of between five and six thousand pupils, who were educated at public expense.

(See Juaros, *Compendio de la Historia de Guatemala*.) The truth of this statement is borne out by the fact that the city was not destroyed until 1526, by Arando, so that the early missionaries had ample opportunity afforded them to collect materials for a trustworthy history.

Medicine and Surgery were not unknown among the ancient Mexicans. I have referred, in a former article, to the fact that the kings and emperors had gardens in which medicinal plants were carefully cultivated. The doctors attended the nobility, but their fees were so high as to be prohibitive to the poor. The latter, however, contrived not to have any diseases they were not able to cure themselves, and as many of them were expert herbalists they succeeded pretty well in eluding the rapacity of the "practicos" or "practitioners." After the Spanish conquest there was no scarcity of able and charitable Spanish physicians.

The attempts at surgery on the part of the ancient Mexicans may have been crude and very painful to the patient, owing to the absence of anæsthetics, but the operations were not devoid of a pretty fair knowledge of the requirements of the case. I have seen over a dozen skulls of Peruvian Indians, upon which the operation of trephining had been practiced. The holes in the cranium appeared to have been made with a saw. The operations, as evinced by the skulls in question, were commented upon favorably at a large gathering of American surgeons held in Brooklyn a few years ago. The Mexican Indian, no doubt, followed the same system of surgery.

Among some interesting relics brought to light by excavations among some Aztec ruins in New Mexico, and made under the auspices of the American Museum of Natural History of New York City, is the skeleton of a girl, supposed to have been twenty years old, bearing evidences of a terrible injury and of primitive surgical treatment. The remains of this girl are described as being wrapped in three layers of materials—the first, an excellently woven cloth; the second, a mantle of feather cloth and the third a mat of plaited rushes. The skeleton lay on its back inclined somewhat to the left. The left hip was badly fractured, a portion of it having been broken away; there were also other breaks and dislocations. In addition, the left forearm showed two breaks and extreme displacements.

Mr. Earl H. Morris, who is in charge of the excavations, in describing this find, says: "At least six splints surrounded the broken arm. The top two of them were removed to give a better view of the region beneath. Since it is to be assumed that there were two or three more splints hidden by the undisturbed earth, the probable total number is eight or nine. The splints are of wood and average seven inches in length, half an inch in width, and a



little over one-fifth of an inch in thickness; of fairly uniform size and cut so as to fit the place they were intended to cover. Each is flat on the inner surface and curved on the outer side. All the bindings which hold them in place were decayed beyond recognition. . . . The treatment of the broken arm seemed to have been within the reach of the surgeon, but as death resulted before sufficient time had elapsed for healing to begin, the final result must remain in doubt. The fact remains, however, that the Pueblo practitioner, as far back as the Stone Age, perhaps, had already learned the use of splints in the treatment of fractures."

I have mentioned the knowledge possessed by the ancient Mexicans concerning the medicinal properties of herbs. In their vapor baths the use of steamed herbs was frequently resorted to, for these people were acquainted with the vapor bath and its benefit to health. Their Termacalli, or vapor houses, were usually built of unburned bricks and looked very much like our old-fashioned Dutch bake-ovens. The floor was slightly convex and lower than the surface of the ground outside. Its greatest diameter was eight feet, its greatest height, six feet. The entrance was just large enough to allow a man to crawl into it on hands and knees. Opposite the entrance was a fireplace, which was fed from outside, the smoke passing out through a hole in the top. When the patient enters the bath, he shuts off the hole in the roof, pours water upon the heated stone floor and thus produces a dense vapor. An attendant beats the vapor downwards, and gently strikes the patient over the body, especially upon the part affected, with a bunch of herbs which have been moistened and steamed so as to give out its medicinal effects. Perspiration now sets in and when the desired effect has been produced, the steam is allowed to escape, and the patient, carefully wrapped in rugs, is carried to his bed. This would seem to antedate the Russian and Turkish baths of our day. Indeed, so great was the knowledge of herbs possessed by these people, that later on, when the celebrated Dr. Hernandez arrived from Spain, the natives, Clavigero tells us, "were able to give him the names and virtues of more than 1,200 plants."

The ancient Mexicans were very fond of athletic sports. Hand-ball, football, foot races, wrestling, jumping and kindred modes of physical development were popular and were indulged in even by the royalty and the nobility. Gymnastics occupied a prominent place in their schools and they were presided over by expert instructors.

When death overtook the Mexican his body was given over to the undertaker or funeral director, who proceeded to dress it in the garb of the god who presided over the family of the deceased. If he

had been a man of war he was invested with the garb of Huetze-lopuchtli, if he met his death by drowning he was clothed in the dress of Tlaloc; while if he died a drunkard he was arrayed in that of Tezalzoncatl, the god of wine.

The degree of the civilization of the Mexicans might be dwelt upon much further, as we have shown in former articles. We might describe their aqueducts that stretched for miles and brought pure and clear water to the congested populations in their large cities; we might describe their temples and palaces, their *chinampas*, or floating gardens which floated from house to house along the shores of the lake and delivered to the housewife vegetables, fruits and flowers plucked from the soil under the very eyes of the purchasers. Then, too, their skill in the working of metals, which was a source of wonder to the metallurgists of Europe; nor must we forget to mention their laws—which were enforced, as ours are not—their dress, the classes into which society was divided, etc. We have described all these things in our former article in this Review (October, 1913).

Our object in this paper has been mainly an effort to remove the "myths" from the eyes of the searchers who do not make researches or who, "making at them" and failing to find them, decide, with the wisdom of the owl that such and such things never happened. To these we would say: "Quærite et invenietis."

MARC F. VALLETTI, LL. D.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

---

REFERENCES—Geronimo Mondiel's "Hist. de Mejico"; Clavigero, S. J., "Historia de las Indias"; Torquemada, "Monarquia Indiana"; Orozco y Bena, "Hist. Antigua"; Veytia, "Hist. Antigua"; Sahagun, "Hist. General de las Cosas de Nueva Espana"; Humboldt, "Vire des Cordilleras"; Father Duran, "Hist. de los Indios"; Ixtlilxochitl, where his statements outside of his "Hist. de los Chichimecas" may be relied upon.

## THE ROLICKING BOBOLINK.

"Have you heard the Bobolink  
 With his merry clank-o-link,  
 On a brier by the roadside balancing?  
 Cocking bright eyes, beady, bold,  
 Telling all that can be told,  
 Of the joy of love and living in the Spring.  
 There's a singer worth your while!  
 I would journey many a mile  
 Just to hear him lead the festival of June,  
 In his black and gold attire  
 Quite the dandy of the choir,  
 Isn't Summer's sweetest story in that tune?  
 He's a good opinion, too,  
 Of his talents. Watch him, do,  
 Showing off with such a lot of feathered fuss!  
 Do you really suppose  
 That his Sunday name he knows  
 To be *Dolychonyx oryzivorus*?"

—Lulu W. Mitchell ("The Bobolink")

THE Bobolink is one of the humorists of the feathered tribe. As one writer, Cheney, says, "The mere mention of his name incites merriment," and most poetical references to him are made in that humorous, care-free manner which is so characteristic of the bird. It seems impossible to write soberly, at least solemnly, of this lively, joyous fellow, or to surround him with a tender, sentimental atmosphere; it would be out of harmony with his nature, for he is all life, animation, sparkle, so full of the joy of living that he bubbles over with it continually. Take his popular name, self-chosen:

"Lo, here comes a harlequin! Where do you think  
 This fellow stands to teeter and prink?  
 On a clover top, where the cattle drink,  
 He chatters his own name—'Bobolink!' "

—Anon. ("Feathered Name Speakers")

"Soaring right up in the bright blue sky,  
 Can't keep track of him if you try;  
 Flitting around in the pasture lot,  
 Likes to be friendly, rather than not;  
 Dancing along the old rail fence,  
 Sunshine and flowers where the woods commence,  
 Got so he almost talks to me,  
 Head a-nodding, he says, says he—  
 'Bob-o-link, o-link, o-link.' "

—Granville Osborne

Of course, the most famous poem on the bird is Bryant's, begin-



ning with the adverb that most fittingly applies to the nature of his subject:

“Merrily swinging on brier and weed,  
Near to the nest of his little dame,  
Over the mountain-side or mead,  
Robert of Lincoln is telling his name:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink;  
Snug and safe is that nest of ours  
Hidden among the summer flowers,  
Chee, chee, chee!”

There is a perfect picture of the bird in the first two lines, a snapshot of him in characteristic attitude and action. But one critic considers Wilson Flagg's “The O'Lincoln Family” a better study of the subject than Bryant's famous composition, because it sounds full of birds, all chattering and talking at once as the species is so fond of doing:

“A flock of merry singing-birds were sporting in the grove;  
Some were warbling cheerily, and some were making love:  
There were Bobolincon, Wadolincon, Winter-Seeble, Conquedle—  
A livelier set was never let by tabor, pipe or fiddle—  
Crying ‘Phew, shew, Wadolincon, see, see Bobolincon!’”

Every writer, and reader, to his taste. Personally, I consider Lulu Mitchell's poem, placed at the head of this article, as full and running over of Bobolink glee as the bird himself. Though a bit of “occasional” doggerel, there is a clever play on the bird's name in this bit of bird politics:

“First rising from a sedgy brook,  
The stump bold Bob-o'-Lincoln took;  
‘Well now, I guess I'm glad,’ said he,  
‘For my free speech a stump to see;  
They couldn't hold me in the mesh  
Of that strange thing they call Sesesh;  
To keep me down they needn't think on—  
Hurrah for Bob-and-Abram-Lincoln!”

—Anon. (“Songs of New England Birds—1863”)

Though these poets have placed Bobolink on various perches—“on a brier by the roadside balancing,” “on a clover top,” “dancing along an old rail fence,” “on brier and weed,” “in the grove,” and above “a sedgy brook,” the bird is distinctly a meadow character, preferring one of the marshy type but stipulating that it must be open and sunny and breezy. No dismal swamps for this gay fellow! Among his many names are three that indicate his love for open fields—Meadow Wink, Mead-o-Wink and Meadow Bird:

The reaper's steel flash sparklingly,  
“In meadows deep with hay, I see

And Bobolinks at play."

—J. T. Thompson ("Even-Time")

Indeed, to be out among the bobolinks is to be in pleasant places:

"So beautiful is it to love, so sweet  
To hear the ripple of the bobolink,  
To smell the clover blossoms white and pink,  
To feel oneself far from the dusty street,  
From dusty souls, from all flare and fret  
Of living, and the fervor of regret."

—Sophie M. Almon-Henseley ("In Content")

It is in the spring that Bobolink is a meadow bird; along in the summer, when the young are strong enough to leave the nest, the family with others that have spent the summer in the same field or others nearby, move to some reedy marsh and there spend the time feeding upon seeds of all kinds, preparing for the Southern migration; which changes Robert from a minstrel to a gourmand:

"The bobolinks are on the oats  
And gorging stills the jocund throats  
That made the meadows ring."

—John Burroughs ("Midsummer in the Catskills")

It is at this time he becomes the Reed-Bird, growing portly of figure and dingy of coat and losing all his tunefulness. Seldom is he called Reed-Bird early in the summer, because "Bobolink" so fits his gay vivacity, but two poets have heard him singing in his Reed-Bird phase:

"As reed-bird pour their rapture  
By the unwintered sea."

—Bliss Carman ("Aftersong")

"The rushes by the riverside thrill with the reed-bird's song,  
And bend to kiss the ripples as the waters flow along."

—S. M. Carpenter ("Arlington")

Because wild rice also figures in his midsummer gourmandizing, also the cultivated crop, Rice-Bird is his Southern name, though, contrary to "Whittier's line, the bird is seldom saying much when in the rice-eating stage:

"De rice-bird mean it when he sing."

—("Song of the Negro Boatmen")

The scientific name, so full of uncommon letters, "*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*," is made up of several Greek terms and means "long-clawed rice-eater."

Dr. Coues has a paragraph on the bird's list of names: "In May, the vivacious, voluble and eccentric Bobolinks pass North, spreading over the meadows of the Middle and Northern States from the Atlantic to Kansas and Dakota, perfecting their black dress and breeding in June and July. After the midsummer change, the

'Reed-Bird' or 'Rice-Bird' comes back, thronging the marshes in immense flocks with the Blackbirds; has simply a chirping note, feeds on the wild oats and wild rice, and becomes extremely fat and is accounted a great delicacy. The name 'Ortolan,' applied by some gunners and restaurateurs to this bird, is a strange misnomer, the Ortolan being a finch of Europe. In the West Indies, where this bird retires in winter, as it does also to Central and South America, it is called 'Butter-Bird.' The names 'Bobolink' and 'Meadow-Wing' are in imitation of its cry; 'Skunk Blackbird' notes the resemblance in color to the obnoxious quadruped."

His patchy black-and-white coat has been described by Bryant, who quite appropriately lets the bird himself point it out with frank pride; also, hints the Reed-Birds' humdrum dungarees in the mate's plain garb:

"Robert of Lincoln is gayly dressed,  
Wearing a bright black wedding coat;  
White are his shoulders and white his crest,  
Hear him call in his merry note:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink,  
Look, what a nice new coat is mine,  
Sure, there was never a bird so fine.  
Chee, chee, chee.

"Robert of Lincoln's Quaker wife,  
Pretty and quiet, with plain brown wings,  
Passing at home a patient life,  
Broods in the grass while her husband sings:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink.  
Brood, kind creature; you need not fear  
Thieves and robbers while I am here.  
Chee, chee, chee.

"Modest and shy as a nun is she,  
One weak chirp is her only note;  
Braggart and prince of braggarts is he,  
Pouring boasts from his little throat:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink.  
Never was I afraid of man;  
Catch me, cowardly knaves, if you can.  
Chee, chee, chee."

In the rippling metre of his lines Bryant has deftly incorporated the lilting character of the Bobolink's hilarious song, while permitting the sentiment of the words to betray the bird's frank self-satisfaction in everything relating to him and his. Yet the poet has



also remembered that even a feathered mischief and coxcomb may respond when duty calls, and become self-sacrificing at need. It is noticeable, too, that Bryant assigns a nobler reason for bobolink's late-summer grubbiness than mere love of good food:

"Six white eggs on a bed of hay,  
Flecked with purple, a pretty sight!  
There as the mother sits all day  
Robert is singing with all his might:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink,  
Nice good wife, that never goes out,  
Keeping house while I frolic about,  
Chee, chee, chee.

"Soon as the little ones chip the shell  
Six wide mouths are open for food;  
Robert of Lincoln bestirs him well,  
Gathering seed for the hungry brood.  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink,  
This new life is likely to be  
Hard for a gay young fellow like me.  
Chee, chee, chee.

"Robert of Lincoln at length is made  
Sober with work and silent with care;  
Off is his holiday garment laid,  
Half forgotten that merry air,  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink;  
Nobody knows but my mate and I,  
Where our nest and our nestlings lie.  
Chee, chee, chee.

Summer wanes; the children are grown;  
Fun and frolic no more he knows;  
Robert of Lincoln's a humdrum crone;  
Off he flies, and we sing as he goes:  
Bob-o'-link, bob-o'-link,  
Spink, spank, spink.  
When you can pipe that merry old strain,  
Robert of Lincoln, come back again.  
Chee, chee, chee."

All in all, Bryant manages to make this summer history a sort of allegory on human life, that the gay-spirited bird cannot escape the humdrum duties it brings, that cares bring on the sober mien of maturity, no matter how faithfully borne. The last verse also contains a covert impeachment of mankind, so prone to lose interest in a thing that has lost its sparkle and gaiety and become dull and humdrum. The bird-loving poet is also a clear-eyed philosopher.

The nest of which Bobolink is so proud has been praised by John Burroughs, or rather, the wisdom in its location: "If I were a bird, in building my nest I should follow the example of the bobolink, placing it in the midst of a broad meadow, where there was no spear of grass, of flower or growth unlike another to mark its site." And he tells of spending hours looking for one whose locality he knew, and even then did not find until Bobolink flew down with food and gave him a hint as to where to look. It was "virtually invisible, the dark gray and yellowish-brown dry grass and stubble of the meadow bottom were exactly copied in the color of the half-fledged young. More than that, they hugged the nest so closely and formed such a compact mass that though there were five of them, they preserved the unit of expression—no single head or form was defined; they were one, and that one was without shape or color, and not separable, except by closest scrutiny, from the one of the meadow bottom."

When the mate is sitting on her lowly nest, her sparrow-like markings of brown streaked with buff makes her practically invisible to the hawk flying above. And the eggs, being of a clayey bluish-white, mottled with dark brown, or purple, as the poet has it, are protectively colored: "six white eggs on a bed of hay flecked with purple," as Bryant describes them, or, according to Dora Read Goodale:

"Softly lined and loosely woven,  
Light blue eggs were in it laid,  
Clear, transparent, blotched with purple,  
Fair to see." —("The Bobolink's Nest")

As Mr. Burroughs says, "There is no concealment, except as the great conceals the little, as the desert conceals the pebble, as the myriad conceals the unit." And, of course, this clever camouflage deceives the curious eye of the two or four-footed prowler.

It is during the mating and brooding that Bobolink is at his merriest—is merry at all, in fact, for later in the year he is too full of calm content to be prankish or hilarious.

Early in May, or even in April, he arrives in the North in full tune:

"Sunshine, laughter, mad desires,  
May day, June day, lucid skies,  
All reckless moods that love inspires,  
The gladdest bird that sings and flies."  
—C. P. Cranch ("The Bobolinks")

Indeed, his song is such a burst of glee that it inspires one poet to a very plausible theory as to how the bird came:

"When Nature had made all her birds,  
With no more cares to think on,

She gave a rippling laugh, and out  
There flew a Bobolinkon.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Still merriest of the merry birds,  
Your sparkle is unfading—  
Pied harlequins of June—no end  
Of song and masquerading."

—C. P. Cranch ("The Bobolink")

Mr. Cranch also finds the bird able to laugh upon occasion, as well as without any other cause except good spirits:

"One day in the bluest of summer weather,  
Sketching under a whispering oak,  
I heard five bobolinks laughing together,  
Over some ornithological joke." —("The Birds")

J. G. Holland, too, notes this laughing quality in the bird's melody:

"And o'er the meads the bobolink  
With vexed perplexity confessed  
His tinkling gutturals in a kink  
Or giggled round his secret nest."  
—("The Mistress of the Manse")

Just as a human being, seized by a paroxysm of laughter, must slap his knees and stamp his feet to take care of the overflow of muscular activity, so Bobolink must laugh in other ways besides vocally. As Neltje Blanchan says: "The rippling, restless music seems to keep his wings in motion, as well as his throat, when it suddenly bursts forth, up he shoots into the air like a skylark, and paddles himself along with just the tips of his wings while it is the 'mad music' that seemingly propels him—then he drops with his song into the grass again."

"The bobolink bubbles o'er with glee  
In tumbling, headlong melody."

—E. R. Sill ("The Two Ways")

"A bobolink rose in the sun-thrilled air,  
A spirit of song, with the blue sky o'er him,  
And his trembling wings from the meadows there,  
As he sang and sang, still upward bore him."  
—Ernest McGaffey ("Out Doors")

"And when the bobolink shall fall  
In rapture to the ground."  
—Lewis G. Wilson ("The Hylodes")

But it takes "the merry month of June," and James Russell Lowell, to inspire Bobolink to his supremest delight. In one of his essays he says: "The bobolinks are generally chance visitors, tinkling through the garden in blossoming time, but this year, owing to the long rains early in the season, their favorite meadows were flooded, and they were driven upland. So I had a pair of them domiciled in



my grass-field. The male used to perch in an apple tree, then in full bloom, and while I stood perfectly still close by, he would circle away, quivering round the entire field of five acres, with no break in his song, and settle down again among the blossoms, to be hurried away almost immediately by a new rapture of music." Lowell worked this over into poetical form, in "Bigelow Papers":

"'Nuff sed, June's bridesman, poet o' the year,  
Gladness on wings, the bobolink is here;  
Half hid in tip-top apple-blooms he swings,  
Or climbs against the breeze with quivering wings,  
Or, givin' way to 't in a mock despair,  
Runs down, a brook o' laughter, thru the air."

Continues the essay: "He had the volubility of an Italian charlatan at a fair, and like him, appeared to be proclaiming the merits of some quack remedy. *Opodeldoc—opodeldoc—try Doctor Lincoln's opodeldoc!* he seemed to repeat over and over again, with a rapidity that would have distanced the deftest-tongued Figaro that ever rattled." Which, in "Under the Willows," becomes anything but quackery:

"But now, oh rapture! Sunshine winged and voiced,  
Gladness of woods, skies, waters, all in one,  
The bobolink has come, and like the soul  
Of the sweet season vocal in a bird,  
Gurgles in ecstasy we know not what  
Save *June! dear June! Now God be praised for June!*"

Otherwhere he records: "The bobolinks build in considerable numbers in a meadow within a quarter of a mile of us. A houseless lane passed through the midst of their camp, and in clear westerly weather, at the right season, one may hear a score of them singing at once. When they are breeding, if I chance to pass, one of the male birds always accompanies me like a constable, flitting from post to post of the rail fence, with a short note of reproof continually repeated, till I am fairly out of the neighborhood. Then he will swing away into the air, and run down the wind, gurgling music without stint over the unheeding tussocks of meadow grass and dark clumps of bulrushes that mark his domain." Regarding this "right season," Lowell himself seems a bit in doubt, or else the bird does have a lyrical revival after nesting is over, in fragmentary bits:

"Meanwhile, that devil-may-care, the bobolink,  
Remembering duty, in mid-quaver stops  
Just ere he sweeps o'er rapture's tremulous brink,  
And 'twixt the windrows most demurely drops."  
—("An Indian Summer Reverie")

If Lowell finds the bird a reckless devil-may-care in the fall, others

have found him entirely unbalanced in the "right season":

"And bobolinks crazy with glee—

So crazy, they soar through the glow of the sunset,

And warble their merriest notes as they fly,

Nor heed how the moths hover low in the hollows,

And the dew gathers soft in the sky."

—Abba G. Woolson ("A Summer's Day")

"The crack-brained bobolink courts his crazy mate,

Poised on a bulrush tipsy with his weight."

—O. W. Holmes ("Astræa")

The "crack-brained" is not putting it strong for Robert, but to call his demure mate "crazy" is classing the innocent with the guilty. I think we all prefer to regard Bobolink as reckless rather than unbalanced:

"Merry madcap on the tree!

Who so happy is as thee?

Is there aught so full of fun

Half so happy, 'neath the sun?

With thy merry whiskodink—

Bobolink! Bobolink!"

—Alexander McLachlan ("Bobolink")

When it comes to describing the quality of his voice, the poets have seemingly agreed upon comparing it to a bell:

"Again I heard the song

Of the glad bobolink, whose lyric throat

Pealed like a tangle of small bells afloat."

—C. G. D. Roberts

"And restless rings the bobolink's bubbly note

From the clear bell that tinkles in his throat."

—A. B. Street

"Broad meadows lying like lagoons

Of sunniest water, on whose swells

Float nodding blooms to tinkling bells

Of bob-o-linkum's wildest tunes." —Hamlin Garland

"In deep Ontarian meadows

The reed-bird will loose his bells."

—Bliss Carman

Mr. Cheney says that "Bobolink is the embodiment of a frolic song, the one inimitable operatic singer of the feathered stage. . . . We must wait for some interpreter with the sound-catching skill of a Blind Tom and the phonograph combined, before we may hope to fasten the kinks and twists of this live music-box." And Alexander Wilson: "He chants such a jingling melody of short, variable notes, uttered with such a seeming confusion and rapidity and continued for a considerable time, that it appears as if a half dozen birds of different kinds were all singing together. Some idea may be formed of this song by striking the high keys of a piano-forte at random,

singly and quickly, making as many sudden contrasts of high and low notes as possible."

"Where the garrulous bobolinks lilt and chime  
Over and over."

—Duncan C. Scott ("A Summer Song")

"From blossom-clouded orchards, far away  
The bobolink tinkled." —Lowell

Mr. Matthews' opinion is interesting: "The Bobolink is indeed a great singer, but the latter part of his song is a species of musical fireworks. He begins bravely enough with a number of well-sustained tones, but presently he accelerates his time, loses track of his motive, and goes to pieces in a burst of musical scintillations. It is a mad, reckless song-fantasia, an outbreak of pent-up, irrepressible glee. The difficulty of either describing or putting upon paper such music is insurmountable. One can follow the singer through the first few whistled bars, and then, figuratively speaking, he lets down the bars and stampedes." Which Mr. Matthews most whimsically represents on the staff with a jumble of notes tipped upside down and sideways, and then betters by starting with a few notes and ending in a zigzag diagram of curlicues resembling a Chinese puzzle. To Charles G. D. Roberts this complicated ending becomes

"The linked bubblings of the bobolink."  
("An Ode to Drowsihood")

Thoreau has an appropriate idea in his praise: "He is just touching the strings of his theorbo, his glassichord, his water organ, and one or two notes globe themselves and fall in liquid bubbles from his tuning throat. It is as if he touched his harp within a vase of liquid melody, and when he lifted it out the notes fell like bubbles from the trembling strings. Methinks they are the most liquidly sweet and melodious sounds I ever heard. They are as refreshing to my ear as the first tinkling and gurgling of a rill to a thirsty man. . . . But away he launches, and the meadow is all bespattered with melody. Its notes fall with the apple blossoms in the orchard. The very divinest part of his strain drops from his overflowing breast *singultim*, in globes of melody. It is the foretaste of such strains as never fell on mortal ears, to hear which we should rush to our doors and contribute all we possess or are. Or it seemed as if in that vase full of melody some notes sphered themselves, and from time to time bubbled up to the surface, and were with difficulty repressed."

"The gay bobolink, whose minstrelsy flows  
Like the bubbling brook through the meadow that goes."  
—Isaac McClellan



Remarks Lowell: "We have no bird whose song will match the nightingale's in compass, none whose note is so rich as that of the European blackbird; but for mere rapture I have never heard the bobolink's rival. Yet his opera season is a short one." He never leaves one in doubt as to his favorite bird:

"Why, I'd give more for one live bobolink  
Than a square mile o' larks in printer's ink."  
—("Bigelow Papers")

Some, indeed, have hinted that it is not water the bird dips his harp into, but something stronger:

"Jolliest of all our birds of singing,  
Best he loved the Bobolink,  
'Hush!' he says, 'The tipsy fairies!  
Hear the little folks in drink!'"  
—Whittier ("The Sycamores")  
"Who's roistering down the orchard,  
There where the clover thins?  
Some rascal's deep in liquor,  
And chuckling o'er his sins.  
Hark, where the hedge-rose blushes,  
Dost hear the cannikin clink?  
Dost hear the flagon's gurgling:  
'Bubble-link—bubble-link—bubble-link?'"  
—Ednah Proctor Clarke

But at the best it can be only distilled dew he drinks, and, as Lowell says, it is mere rapture that makes him act so irresponsible. Mr. Burroughs even hears him preach "temperance," among other bits of advice: "Sometimes he begins with the word *gegue*, *gegue*. Then again, more fully, *be true to me, Clarsy, be true to me, Clarsy, Clarsy*, thence full tilt into his unimitable song, interspersed in which the words *kick your slipper*, *kick your slipper*, and *temperance*, *temperance* (the last with a peculiar nasal resonance), are plainly heard."

"The tipsy bobolink, struggling with the chain  
Of tinkling music that perplexed his wings."  
—J. G. Holland

Being a strictly American bird, he is not mentioned by the European poets; I have found but one reference to him in Continental poetry, and that in Browning's "Mr. Sludge the Medium," the scene of whose action is in America:

"I fancy a friend stands whistling all in white,  
Blithe as a bobolink, and he's dead, I learn."

No paper on the literature of the Bobolink would be complete without reference to that charmingly playful description of him in Irving's "Birds of Spring":

"The happiest bird of our spring, and one that rivals the European lark, in my estimation, is the Bobolincon, or Bobolink, as he is commonly called. He arrives at that choice portion of our year which, in this latitude, answers to the description of the month of May so often given by the poets. With us it begins about the middle of May and lasts until nearly the middle of June. Earlier than this, winter is apt to return on its traces, and to blight the opening beauties of the year; and later than this begin the parching, and panting, and dissolving heats of summer. But in this genial interval, nature is in all her freshness and fragrance: 'the rains are over and gone, the flowers appear upon the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in the land.' The trees are now in their fullest foliage and brightest verdure; the woods are gay with the clustered flowers of the laurel; the air is perfumed by the sweetbrier and the wildrose; the meadows are enameled with clover blossoms; while the young apple, the peach, and the plum, begin to swell, and the cherry to grow, among the green leaves.

"This is the chosen season of revelry of the Bobolink. He comes amidst the pomp and fragrance of the season; his life seems all sensibility and enjoyment, all song and sunshine. He is to be found in the soft bosoms of the freshest and sweetest meadows, and is most in song when the clover is in blossom. He perches on the topmost twig of a tree, or on some long flaunting weed, and as he rises and sinks with the breeze, pours forth a succession of rich tinkling notes, crowding one upon another like the outpouring melody of the skylark, and possessing the same rapturous character. Sometimes he pitches from the summit of a tree, begins his song as soon as he gets upon the wing, and flutters tremulously down to the earth, as if overcome with ecstasy at his own music. Sometimes he is in pursuit of his paramour; always in full song, as if he would win her by his melody, and always with the same appearance of intoxication and delight.

"Of all the birds of our groves and meadows, the Bobolink was the envy of my boyhood. He crossed my path in the sweetest weather and the sweetest season of the year, when all nature called to the fields, and the rural feeling throbbed in every bosom; but when I, luckless urchin! was doomed to be mewed up, during the livelong day, in that purgatory of boyhood, a schoolroom. It seemed as if the little varlet mocked at me as he flew by in full song, and sought to taunt me with his happier lot. Oh, how I envied him! No lessons, no task, no hateful school; nothing but holiday frolic, green fields and fine weather.

"Further observation and experience have given me a different

idea of this little feathered voluptuary, which I will venture to impart, for the benefit of my schoolboy readers, who may regard him with the same unqualified envy and admiration which I once indulged. I have shown him only as I saw him at first, in what I may call the poetical part of his career, when he in a manner devoted himself to elegant pursuits and enjoyments, and was a bird of music and song and taste and sensibility and refinement. While this lasted, he was sacred from injury; the very schoolboy would not fling a stone at him, and the merest rustic would pause to listen to his strain. But mark the difference. As the year advances, as the clover blossoms disappear, and the spring fades into summer, he gradually gives up his elegant tastes and habits, doffs his poetical suit of black, assumes a russet dusty garb, and sinks to the gross enjoyments of common, vulgar birds. His notes no longer vibrate on the ear; he is stuffing himself with the seeds of the tall weeds on which he lately swung and chanted so melodiously. He has become a *bon vivant*, a *gourmand*; with him now there is nothing like the "joys of the table." In a little while he grows tired of plain, homely fare, and is off on a gastronomical tour in quest of foreign luxuries. We next hear of him, with myriads of his kind, banqueting among the reeds of the Delaware; and grown corpulent with good feeding. He has changed his name in traveling. Bobolincon no more—he is the *Reed-bird* now, the much sought for tidbit of Pennsylvania epicures; the rival in unlucky fame of the ortolan! Wherever he goes, pop! pop! pop! every rusty firelock in the country is blazing away. He sees his companions falling by thousands around him.

"Does he take warning and reform? Alas, not he! Incorrigible epicure! again he wings his flight. The rice swamps of the South invite him. He gorges himself among them almost to bursting; he can scarcely fly for corpulency. He has once more changed his name, and is now the famous *Rice-bird* of the Carolinas.

"Last stage of his career: behold him spitted, with dozens of his corpulent companions, and served up, a vaunted dish, on the table of some Southern gastronome.

"Such is the story of the Bobolink; once spiritual, musical, admired, the joy of the meadows and the favorite bird of spring; finally, a gross little sensualist, who expiates his sensuality in the larder. His story contains a moral worthy the attention of all little birds and little boys; warning them to keep to those refined and intellectual pursuits which raised him to so high a pitch of popularity during the early part of his career; but to eschew all tendency to that gross and dissipated indulgence which brought this mistaken little bird to an untimely end.



"Which is all at present, from the well-wisher of little boys and little birds,  
 Geoffrey Crayon, Gent."

But when the spring comes again, the Reed-bird is once more the

"Bobolink, that in the meadow  
 Or beneath the orchard's shadow,  
 Keep'st up a constant prattle,  
 Joyous as my children's prattle,  
 Welcome to the north again."

—Thomas Hill

Mr. Burroughs, too, has some charmingly whimsical things to say of this meadow character, this "bird of parts" so unlike his fellows:

"Throughout the northern and eastern parts of the Union the lark would find a dangerous rival in the bobolink, a bird that has no European prototype, and no near relatives anywhere—standing quite alone, unique, and in the qualities of hilarity and musical tintinnabulation, with a song unequaled. He has already a secure place in general literature, having been laureated by no less a poet than Bryant, and invested with a lasting human charm in the sunny page of Irving, and is the only one of our songsters, I believe, the mocking bird cannot parody or imitate. He affords the most marked example of exuberant pride, and a glad, rollicking, holiday spirit that can be seen among our birds. Every note expresses complacency and glee. He is a beau of the first pattern, and, unlike any other bird of my acquaintance, pushes his gallantry to the point of wheeling gayly into the train of every female that comes along, even after the season of courtship is over and the matches all settled; and when she leads him on too wild a chase, he turns lightly about and breaks out with a song that is precisely analogous to a burst of gay and self-satisfied laughter, as much as to say, 'Ha! ha! ha! I must have my fun Miss Silverthimble, thimble, thimble, if I break every heart in the meadow, see, see, see!' At the approach of the breeding season, the bobolink undergoes a complete change; his form changes, his color changes, his flight changes. From mottled brown or brindle he becomes black and white, earning, in some localities, the shocking name of 'skunk bird'; his small, compact form becomes broad and conspicuous, and his ordinary flight is laid aside for a mincing, affected gait, in which he seems to use only the tips of his wings. It is very noticeable what a contrast he presents to his mate at this season, not only in color but in manners, she being as shy and retiring as he is forward and hilarious. Indeed, she seems disagreeably serious and indisposed to any fun or jollity, scurrying away at his approach, and apparently annoyed at every endearing word and look. It is surprising that all this parade of plumage and tinkling of cymbals should be gone through with and persisted in to please a creature so coldly indifferent as she really seems to be. If Robert O'Lincoln has been stimulated

into acquiring this holiday uniform and this musical gift by the approbation of Mrs. Robert, as Darwin, with his sexual selection principle would have us believe, then there must have been a time when the females of this tribe were not quite so chary of their favors as they are now. Indeed, I never knew a female bird of any kind that did not appear utterly indifferent to the charms of voice and plumage that the male birds are so fond of displaying. But I am inclined to believe that the males think only of themselves and of outshining each other, and not at all of the approbation of their mates as, in an analogous case in a higher species, it is well known who the females dress for and whom they want to kill with envy! I know of no other songbird that expresses so much self-consciousness and vanity, and comes so near being an ornithological coxcomb. The red-bird, the yellow-bird, the indigo-bird, the oriole, the cardinal grosbeak and others, all birds of brilliant plumage and musical ability, seem quite unconscious of self, and neither by tone nor act challenge the admiration of the beholder."

"Thou vocal sprite! Thou feather'd troubadour!

In pilgrim weeds through many a clime a ranger,

Com'st thou to doff thy russet suit once more,

And play in foppish trim the masquerading stranger?

Philosophers may teach thy whereabouts and nature;

But wise as all of us, perforce, must think 'em;

The schoolboy best hath fixed thy nomenclature,

And poets, too, must call thee Bob o'Linkum."

—Charles Fenno Hoffman

HARRIETTE WILBUR.

Duluth, Minn.

## THE FORGET-ME-NOT.

"Sweet was the fancy of those antique ages  
 That put a heart in every stirring leaf,  
 Writing deep morals upon Nature's pages,  
 Turning sweet flowers into deathless sages,  
 To calm our joy and sanctify our grief.  
 And gladly would I know the man or child,  
 But no! It surely was a pensive girl  
 That gave so sweet a name to flowerlet wild,  
 A harmless innocent, and unbeguiled,  
 To whom a flower is precious as a pearl."  
 —Hartley Coleridge ("The Forget-Me-Not")

IN ALL the European languages, the popular name of the pretty *Myosotis palustris* bears a name similar in meaning to the English Forget-me-not; it is "Ne m'oubliez pas" or "Souvenez-vous de moi," in French; "Vergissmeinnicht," in German; "Niezboudka," in Russian, and "Nontiscordardime," in Italian. For many centuries it has been regarded as the emblem of fidelity; and in legend and literature the flower which arouses remembrance plays its distinctive role.

"And where the ground is bright with friendship's tears,  
 Forget-me-nots and violets, heavenly blue,  
 Spring, glittering with the cheerful drops like dew."  
 —N. Mueller ("The Paradise of Tears") Tr. Bryant

Though many of the flowers speak their history in their names, the forget-me-not also betrays the legends regarding its origin, of which there are several.

As it is a frequenter of moist places, what more fitting than the following story could be told of the blossom: "Two lovers were loitering on the margin of a lake, one fine summer's evening, when the maiden espied some of the flowers of the *Myosotis* growing on the water, close to the bank of an island, at some distance from the shore. She expressed a desire for them, whereupon her knight, in the true spirit of chivalry, sprang into the water, and swimming to the spot, gathered the plant; but his strength was unable to beat back against the strong current, and seeing that he could not regain the shore, although very near to it, he threw the flowers upon the bank, and casting a last affectionate look upon the frantic but helpless maiden, he cried 'Forget-me-not!' and disappeared beneath the waters. And, faithful to him, she wore the flowers in her hair till the day of her death."



"I move the sweet forget-me-nots  
That grow for happy lovers."

—Tennyson ("The Brook")

"And therein lurks, an azure speck,  
The tiny starred forget-me-not—  
Fond type of hearts that love and long  
In lonely faith, at Hougoumont."

—Alfred Domett ("Hougoumont")

"Sad forget-me-not's a token  
Full of partings and mishaps."

—Anon.

A Persian legend relates how in the world's morning an angel sat weeping at the gates of light, for he had loved a daughter of the earth, and so forfeited his place in heaven. He had first seen the girl at a river edge, decorating her hair with forget-me-nots, and as a punishment for losing his heart to her he was barred from paradise till the woman had planted forget-me-nots in every corner of the world. It was a tedious task, but for great love she undertook it, and so for years, in all climes and weathers, they wandered over the globe together, planting

"By rivulet, or spring, or wet roadside,  
The blue and bright-eyed flowerlet of the brook,  
Hope's gentle gem, the sweet forget-me-not!"

—S. T. Coleridge ("The Keepsake")

When the task was ended the couple appeared once more at the gates, and behold, they were not closed against them. The woman was admitted without death, since, as said the keepers of the way: "Your love is greater than your wish for life; and as he on whom you have bestowed yourself is an angel, so love of the heavenly has raised you above corruption. Enter, therefore, into the joys of heaven, the greatest of which is unselfish love."

"The blue flower, which—Brahmans says—  
Blooms nowhere but in Paradise."

—Anon.

"'Remember,' forget-me-not murmurs,  
'Remember us each and all.'"

—Helen I. Moorhouse

"And faith, that a thousand ills can brave,  
Speaks in thy blue leaves, forget-me-not."

—J. G. Percival ("The Language of Flowers")

Another old tradition cites that when God named all the plants, He overlooked this plant because it was so small. Afterward, as He passed through the groves and gardens, He called these names, to find if they were accepted, and every plant bowed and whispered its assent. His walk was almost over when a small voice at His feet asked, "By what name am I called, Father?" Looking down, He saw this little flower peeping shyly at Him from the shadow.

Struck with its beauty, and His own forgetfulness, He answered, "As I forgot you before, let Me name you in a way to show I shall remember you again: You shall be Forget-me-not." In another version, it is the flower that forgets its name:

"When to the flowers so beautiful the Father gave a name,  
Back came a little blue-eyed one, all timidly it came;  
And standing at the Father's feet and gazing in His face,  
It said, in low and trembling tones and with a modest grace,  
'Dear God, the name Thou gavest me, alas, I have forgot!'  
The Father kindly looked Him down and said, 'Forget-me-not!'"  
—Anon.

A new legend of the *Myosotis* has been devised by F. W. Bourdillon: When *Psyche* was banished from the presence of *Cupid*, as a punishment for disobedience to her promise never to seek to know his identity, she wandered long and far, weeping bitterly over her fault. And

"The big tears from her blue eyes running down  
Fell on earth's pitying bosom,  
Suddenly there sprang amid the sedges brown  
Blue as her eyes a blossom."

Tradition, too often untruthful, but frequently entertaining in its ingenuity, says that when Henry of Lancaster was an exile, he adopted the forget-me-not as his badge, and that his adherents regarded the flower as setting forth his feelings; some have even ventured to derive its English name from this supposed fact.

"I am the flower that every age has sung,  
My name has trembled on the unwilling tongue,  
'Midst sad farewells how mournfully has run:  
Forget-me not!" —Isabella M. Mortimer

"Oft wandering on a foreign shore,  
The exile's eyeballs brimming o'er  
With sudden tears  
Look upon thee, and thoughts of home  
In melancholy visions come  
In doubts and fears."

—Jose Joaquin Dedlas ("Flor Modesta y Delicida")

Once upon a time, a shepherd was driving his flock over the *Ilsestein*, when, wearied with his journey, he leaned upon his staff. Instantly the mountain opened, for his staff was resting upon this flower beloved by the fairy Princess *Ilse*. Within the opening thus made he saw the Princess, who bade him fill his pockets with gold. This he was not loth to do; and having obeyed the royal behest, was just about to leave, when the fairy exclaimed "Forget not the best!" alluding to his wonder-working staff, upon the point of which still hung the magic blossom. Thinking, however, that she meant

the best gold, he left his staff leaning against the wall of rock, and proceeded to gather up more of the precious metal. In this way, he was unable to leave the cave, and when suddenly the mountain closed again, he remained a prisoner.

"Ah, dearest, may the elves that sway  
Thy fancies come from emerald plots,  
Where they have dozed and dreamed all day  
In hearts of blue forget-me-nots."

—Henry Timrod ("A Serenade")

It is said that the forget-me-nots which were found in the streams and pools on and near the field of Waterloo after the Duke of Wellington's victory there, sprang from the blood of the troops who fell during the engagement.

"As when our blood the mouse-ear drank  
And red the river ran." —William Morris ("Song")

"And—vain memento of the spot—  
The turquoise-eyed forget-me-not."

—Francis T. Palgrave; ("A Danish Barrow")

When the name of the plant is so rich in legendary lore, it is but natural that the poet should make much of the meaning of the blossom, or its name:

"The brook that mirrored clear the sky—  
Full well I know the spot—

The mouse-ear looked with bright blue eye  
And said, 'Forget-me-not.'

And from the brook I turned away  
But heard it many an after day."

—John Clare

"And tenderest forget-me-nots

That e'er a lover honored yet

With glance made sweet by sweetest thoughts  
Are softly in the grasses set."

—Cora K. Aitken ("Near Cannes")

"Every heart with its garden

There the forget-me-nots cluster."

—E. R. Sill

"A small blue flower with yellow eye

Hath mightier spell to move my soul

Than even the mightiest notes which roll

From man's most perfect minstrelsy."

—C. G. D. Roberts ("A Blue Blossom")

In Italy, this is a much cherished blossom, sacred to lovers, because it is the changed form of a pretty maid who was drowned. In France, where it is a symbol of eternal affection, it is sometimes known as "The eyes of Our Lady." An order of knighthood, in the fourteenth century, wore the flower as a device. The old name of the plant was Scorpion-Grass, and three hundred years ago, the plant, as one authority states, had "none other known name than this." It was probably called Scorpion-Grass on account of its



flower-spike resembling the tail of that creature; in consequence of which, on the theory that a plant indicated its use by its peculiar appearance—the doctrine of signatures—it was supposed to be good against the sting of a scorpion. “*Myosotis*” a Latinized form of its Greek name meaning “mouse-ear” is derived from the plant’s hairy stems and leaves.

*Myosotis palustris* will grow in dry places, but thrives best in muddy ditches, rivulets, and near open springs of water, and so the poet has observed how “Forget-me-nots deck each dim nook”:

“The blue myosotis, peeping out,  
Whispers forget-me-not over my face.”  
—Anon. (“The Spring”)

“And azure-eyed forget-me-nots  
Each oozy marge that lined.”  
—Anon. (“The Thames”)

“I see the threadlike brooklets trickle down  
To kiss forget-me-nots in restful delis.”  
—Emily H. Taylor (“The Purple Falls”)

“Our meadow-path had memorable spots;  
One where it bridged a tiny rivulet  
Deep hid by tangled blue forget-me-nots!”  
George Eliot (“Brother and Sister”)

The spike-like racemes of bright-blue, yellow-throated corollas are that color the poet dotes upon, and many are the praises which have been heaped upon the blossom. He finds “forget-me-nots, as blue as if the pale reflected sky had tinged their petals” (Arlo Bates); or, in the words of Margaret E. Sangster, “Forget-me-nots that from the sky their tender blueness took”, or according to John Hutton: “Forget-me-nots, whose paler blue from summer sky was borrowed.” To another poet,

“Like eyes of angels, looking on through tears  
Thou lookest forth from brookside softly fair.”  
—A. H. Japp (“Forget-Me-Nots”)

J. W. Courthope, describing “The Chancellor’s Garden,” tells us that “There was seen the blue forget-me-not, flashing through all her flowers Lake Leman’s blue.” Few of the poets have observed the yellow throats of the corollas, but one most fittingly describes the blossoms as

“Blue forget-me-nots that seemed  
Like to turquoise stones when gold  
Their blue beauty doth enfold.” —Strachey

Perhaps it is the gold in the flower which prompted Longfellow to make that well-known comparison in “Evangeline”:

"Silently, one by one, in the infinite meadows of heaven  
Blossomed the lovely stars, the forget-me-nots of the angels."

Altogether, it is a dearly beloved blossom, and so it is not merely as a good rhyming word that it decorates many a bit of verse; the poet's affection dictated its use, and his skill found a rhyme for the flower's name.

"And in one calm, grassy spot  
Starry, blue forget-me-not."

—Adelaide Anne Proctor ("Discouraged")

"There humbly in a distant plot  
Clusters the blue forget-me-not."

—W. J. Cameron ("The Garden")

"And thick in many a sunny spot  
There blows the pale forget-me-not."

—Dora R. Goodale ("Spring")  
HARRIETTE WILBUR.

Duluth, Minn.

## ON MEDIÆVAL SANCTUARY.

THE law of sanctuary contributed largely to associate in the popular imagination the ideas of sanctity and of mercy, and to increase the reverence for human life. Obviously erroneous is the suggestion that places of refuge were established with a view to protecting unintentional offenders from punishment or revenge. Among the real immunities of the clergy under the Christian emperors may be ranked the right of sanctuary; that is, a right granted to persons accused, who take refuge in a church or in any other place, of not being prosecuted, at least during a certain time or by certain persons. The origin and nature of this law are admirably explained in a memoir on the subject, read in 1711 before the Academy of Inscriptions by Father Simon, one of the most eminent academicians of his day. "As soon," he observes, "as men had commenced to invoke the Author of nature, when they had erected altars to Him and offered Him sacrifices, to acknowledge Him as the sovereign Arbiter of their destinies and to implore His assistance, they regarded Him as present in a special manner in the places where they celebrate His mysteries, and they dreaded to show themselves rigid towards others, when they sought to conciliate His clemency for themselves. This respectful fear disposed them to treat favorably those who took refuge there, and to prohibit all violence towards the opinion of those who represent ecclesiastical immunities as prescribed by the divine law or the natural law, which all the princes of the earth are bound to respect, and which they never can dispense with. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that these same facts can easily be reconciled with the opinion which regards ecclesiastical immunities as founded solely on positive law, in the sense explained by Cardinal Bellarmine. It has been suggested that the privilege was to give time for the first heat of resentment to pass over before the injured party could seek redress, but this hardly accounts for its origin. In the infancy of society especially, and in general in all nations not much advanced in civilization, nothing is more useful than the right of sanctuary to supply the defect of laws and government; to check the revenge of individuals, who commonly imagine that they have a right to do justice to themselves; finally, to prevent or to moderate the first impulses of revenge, which are often unjust, and always dangerous. Montesquieu himself, struck with these considerations, could not but admire on this point the wisdom of the laws of Moses, and approve generally the right of sanctuary, provided it were placed under proper restrictions, to prevent abuses. "As the Divinity," he observes, "is



the refuge of the unfortunate, and as none are more unfortunate than criminals, men have been naturally led to believe that the temples were an asylum for them; and this idea appeared more natural among the Greeks, among whom murderers expelled from their city and from the society of men, seemed to have no other home but the temples, no other protectors but the gods. This right regarded at first none but involuntary homicides; but when great criminals were included in it, there was a gross inconsistency; for if they had offended men, much more had they offended the gods. The laws of Moses were very wise. Involuntary homicides were innocent; but they should be removed from the sight of the relatives of the slain; a sanctuary was therefore established for them. Great criminals deserve no sanctuary: they had none. The Jews had only a portable tabernacle, which continually was changing its place; that excluded the idea of a sanctuary. It is true they were to have a temple; but the criminals who might flock thither from all parts would trouble divine service. If the homicides were expelled from their country, as among the Greeks, they might, it was to be feared, adore strange gods. All these considerations led to the establishment of cities of sanctuary, where the fugitives should remain until the death of the sovereign pontiff." Again, it has been supposed that the right of sanctuary bears testimony to the power of certain places to transmit their virtues to those who entered them. Among nearly all peoples of the world at different stages of civilization are to be found "totem" centres; from the Aruntas of Australia, the Arckenas of North America to the inhabitants of Hawaii, and to the Mohammedans of Persia and Morocco, while the Balder's Grove in the beautiful Sogne Fiord in Norway was a famous sanctuary to the Northern peoples. In the Old Testament<sup>1</sup> the six cities of refuge were set apart to protect people who had committed murder unintentionally. While in these cities the person who wished to avenge the murder was unable to touch the murderer, and after the death of the high priest he was free permanently. In Christian times, however, sanctuary, being a privilege of the Church, did not extend to sacrilege.

Like every other ecclesiastical foundation, the right of sanctuary was originally a beneficent and wise institution, designed by the Church for the protection of the weak and the prevention of revenge, wild justice, violence and oppression. If a man, in those days of swift wrath and ready hand, should kill another in the madness of a moment; if by accident he should wound or maim another; if by the breaking of any law he should incur the penalties of justice; if

---

<sup>1</sup> Numbers xxxv.

by any action he should incur the hostility of a stronger man; if by some of the many changes and chances of fortune he should lose his worldly goods and fall into debt or bankruptcy, and so become liable to imprisonment; if he had cause to dread the displeasure of king, baron or Bishop—the right of sanctuary was open to him. Once on the frith-stool, once clinging to the horns of the altar, he was as safe as an Israelite within the walls of a city of refuge: the mighty hand of the Church was over him; his enemies could not touch him, on pain of excommunication.

The right of sanctuary, under wise restrictions, was too much in keeping with the mild and merciful principles of the Christian religion not to enlist in its defense the warmest sympathies of the clergy. Hence, we find the Bishops and councils testifying generally great zeal for its preservation, and appealing to it with almost invariable success, sometimes in defense of persecuted innocence, sometimes to obtain the pardon of criminals who had taken refuge in the church, or to obtain at least a mitigation of the punishment which they had incurred; but above all, to prevent the rigor of human justice from depriving them, as was frequently the case, of the spiritual succors which religion never refuses to sinners, and which none need more than the greatest criminals.<sup>2</sup> These were the true motives of the zeal which Bishops and councils invariably evinced for the maintenance of the right of sanctuary; they knew well, it is true, the authority vested in the magistrate for the repression and the punishment of crimes opposed to public order and to the rights of individuals; and far from wishing that guilt should go unpunished, they strongly acknowledged the necessity of inflicting in certain cases severe punishment on criminals; but they wished that the severity of the magistrate, as well as of the government, should be tempered by clemency; and that in punishing sin, nothing should be left untried to save the sinner, in order that the temporal punishment of the criminals should contribute to their eternal salvation. St. Augustine explains all these views admirably in a letter to Macedonius, vicar of Africa, in which he treats the subject fully.

The right of sanctuary had been accorded to pagan temples by Imperial decrees of Rome, and in some cases extended not only to altars, but to such things as persons and standards.<sup>3</sup> Slaves at the time of Seneca were allowed to seek shelter at the statues of the gods.<sup>4</sup> Early Christianity soon introduced the right of asylum to

---

<sup>2</sup> The lives of St. Augustine, St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom contain many remarkable examples of this charitable interference of the prelates in favor both of criminals and of the innocent.

<sup>3</sup> Suetonius, "*Vita Tiberii*," c. 37; Tacitus, "*Annal.*," iii., 60.

<sup>4</sup> De Clem. i., 18.

the churches. Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria, as Liberatus<sup>5</sup> and Evagrius<sup>6</sup> report, took sanctuary in the baptistery of the church, to avoid the fury of the Monophysite faction headed by Timotheus Ælurus; and though that was a place which even the barbarians themselves had some reverence for, yet, as the Egyptian Bishops complain in their letter to the Emperor Leo,<sup>7</sup> the malice of the Monophysites pursued him thither, and there slew him, mangled his body, dragged it about the streets, and at last burnt it to ashes, and scattered his ashes to the wind; for which unparalleled barbarity committed against the laws of religion, the Emperor Leo deposed Timotheus Ælurus, and sent him into banishment all his life. Eutropius, the minister of Arcadius, says that Christian people who were chased by a crowd were accorded refuge; Gregory of Nazianzus<sup>8</sup> tells that the Church harbored noble widows who were exposed to the intrusion of greedy men. St. Basil<sup>9</sup> tells of slaves for their faith doing the same. The legal privilege of affording refuge was conceded to the Church from the first ages of the Emperors becoming Christians. In Synesius<sup>10</sup> and other ancient writers the altar is frequently called *asulos trapexa*, the table from which no one could be ravished or taken away. During the holy seasons of Lent and Easter no criminal trials could be held, and no criminal could be tortured or executed. Two laws to this effect were enacted in the East by the liberal piety of Theodosius the Elder in 380, and in the West by Honorius in 414.<sup>11</sup> But Theodosius in 392 deprived bankrupts of the privilege—*publii debitores*.<sup>12</sup> A decree that follows the fifty-sixth canon of the fourth synod of Carthage in 399 enacts that the Bishops Epigorius and Vincent should be sent to the Emperor to beg for the churches the *jus asylorum*. St. Augustine in his "De Civitate Dei" mentions that after the taking of Rome in 410, Alaric spared all those who had taken refuge in the churches. Papal sanction was first given to it by Leo I., about 460, though the first

<sup>5</sup> Breviar., c. 15 (t. 5, p. 763e). Et ante triduum Paschæ, quo coena Domini celebratur, ab ipsis turbis concluditur in ecclesia sanctæ memoriæ Proterius, quo se timore contulerat, ibique eadem die in baptisterio occiditur, laniatur, ejecitur, et funus ejus incenditur, sparguntur et cineres ejus in ventos.

<sup>6</sup> L. 2, c. 8 (leg. 3). (Vol. III., p. 299, 38.)

<sup>7</sup> Ad Cale. C. Chalced., n. 22. (CC., t. 4, p. 894b.) . . . Percusserunt inculpabilem vivum, eumque crudeliter occiderunt, etc.

<sup>8</sup> Or. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Reg. Fus Tract., inten. ii.

<sup>10</sup> Ep. 58.

<sup>11</sup> Cod., Jus. i., tit. 12.

<sup>12</sup> "Publicos debitores (i. e. tributorum debitores), si confugiendum ad ecclesias crediderint, aut illico extrahi de latebris oportebit, aut pro his ipsos qui eos occultare probantur, episcopos exigi (i. e. ad solvendum compelli). Sciat igitur praeclens auctoritas tua, neminem debitorum (publicorum) posthac à clericis defendendum; aut per eos ejus quem defendendum esse crediderint debitum esse solvendum."—Cod. Theod., lib. IX., tit. xlv., n. 1.



Council of Orange had dealt with the matter in 441. It was then forbidden to cross the threshold of the church with arms, and the number of cases was limited for which the right of asylum was allowed.

But then even this benefit was not universal; for the *Jewish converts* were particularly excepted from it. For by a law of Arcadius and Honorius, extant in both the Codes,<sup>13</sup> it was provided, "that all Jews, who, being either in debt, or under prosecution as criminals, pretended to unite themselves to the Christian religion, that thereby they might have the privilege of taking sanctuary in the church, and avoid the punishment of their crimes or burden of their debts, should be rejected, and not received till they had discharged their debts, or proved themselves innocent of the crimes laid against them." Yet, in other cases, the Jews were not denied this benefit, but had the common privilege of sanctuary with other men, if Gothofred<sup>14</sup> judge right, who cites Julius Clarus<sup>15</sup> and Petrus Sarpus<sup>16</sup> for the same opinions.

Rittershusius<sup>17</sup> thinks the case of heretics and apostates was something worse in this respect than that of Jews; because they who deserted the Church were wholly excluded from having any benefit of sanctuary in it. Covarruvias<sup>18</sup> and Panormitan<sup>19</sup> and Sarpus<sup>20</sup> collect the same before him, but not from any express law about this matter, but only from a general law of Theodosius and Valen-

<sup>13</sup> Cod. Theod. 1. p., tit. xlv., leg. 2 (t. 3, p. 360.)—Cod Justin, 1. i. tit. xii., leg. i. (t. 4., p. 206.) Judaei, qui, reatu aliquo vel debitis fatigati, simulant se Christianae legi velle conjungi, ut ad ecclesias confugientes evitare possint crimina, vel pondera debitorum, arceantur, nec ante suscipiantur, quam debita universa reddiderint.

<sup>14</sup> In loc. (ibid., p. 361, col. dextr.) Contra innoxii et debito liberis Judaeis eam immunitatem constare humanitatis ratio putatur. De qua alloquin quaestione videndus Julius Clarus, alique, et e Recentioribus, qui haud ita pridem de Jure Asyli scripsit, Petrus Sardus (leg. Sarpus.), c. 5, p. 58.

<sup>15</sup> Sententiar. 1, 5, quaest. 30, n. 17. (Oper Genev. 1664, p. 568.) Praeterea quaero numquid Judaei, confugientes ad ecclesiam, gaudeant ejus immunitate? etc.

<sup>16</sup> De Jure Asyli, c. 5. (p. 58.) Judaei supersunt, etc.

<sup>17</sup> De Asylis, c. 6. (p. 90, nn. 6, 7.) Jus, asyli et perfugii commune etiam est et patet non tantum orthodoxis, sed etiam errantibus Giphani. in Oecon. Cod., p. 18, n. 55.—Non vero haereticis. Panormit. ad c. Inter alia, n. 21. Covarruv., 1, 2. Var. Resol. c. 20, n. 13.—Multo minus infidelibus. Pet. Sarp. de Jure Asyli, c. 5, in fin.—Neque apostatis, qui omnibus favoribus et defensoribus ecclesiae catholicae destituuntur. 1, 3, c. de Apostatis.

<sup>18</sup> Episcopus Segobiensis, q. v. Variar. Resolution. 1, 2, c. 20. De ecclesiarum et templorum sacrorum immunitate, n. ii. (Antverp. 1638. t. 2, p. 204.) . . . Quamvis excommunicato prosit ecclesiarum immunitas, non tamen ecclesiarum immunitas, non tamen proderit infideli, etc. . . . Eadem ratione haereticus non est ab ecclesia defendendus, etc.

<sup>19</sup> Al. Tudeschis., Commentar. in Quinque Libros Decretalium, Lugdun. 1586. That edition I have not seen, neither can I readily find the precise words alluded to in the midst of the various sections of the chapter "De immunitate ecclesiarum," etc., in the only copy I can conveniently command, viz. Nuremberg, 1486, without title and pagination.

<sup>20</sup> Ubi supr. (p. 60). Quodcunque vero Judaeis dicitur infideles omnes amplectitur, etc.

tinian,<sup>21</sup> which excludes apostates and heretics from all society, and many other common privileges allowed to other men. From whence they conclude by parity of reason, that they could lay no claim to the benefit of sanctuary in any case; because deserters of religion, which they had once owned in baptism, were reckoned worse than Jews, who had never made a profession of it. And therefore, by another law of Theodosius,<sup>22</sup> their slaves were entitled to the favor which the masters themselves were denied; for if the slave of an apostate or heretic fled from his master, and took sanctuary in the church, he was not only to be protected, but to have his manumission or freedom granted him likewise: there being an equal design in the law to encourage orthodoxy, and discourage heresy and apostasy by respective rewards and punishments allotted to them. The Justinian Code forbade refugees to make any clamorous petitions to the Emperor on such festivals as he came to any church; if, however, they had any request to make, they should do it privately, by the Archbishop or defensor of the church: otherwise they should forfeit their privilege and be cast out of the church and be delivered over to the city magistrate to be punished. The laws of Theodosius were not made to authorize the thing itself, but to regulate some points relating to it. Baronius affirms it upon the credit of the Acts of Pope Sylvester.

Gregory the Great (590-604) enacted that the use of asylum was to be used to further the interests of equity and justice, and not to screen malefactors from punishment. "*Si iustam contra dominos suos querellam habuerint, cum congrua ordinatione de ecclesiis exire necesse est. Si vero venialem culpam commiserint, dominiis suis accepto de venia sacramento sine mora reddantur.*" It was the custom for government functionaries, when retiring from office, to fly for refuge to the asylums offered by the Church, and there to remain until assured of their safety by an Imperial notary. The ex-Prefect Gregory adopted this course, and we find a series of letters from Pope Gregory the Great<sup>23</sup> to various influential persons, in which he earnestly recommends the fugitives for protection against the despotism of the judges. But the immunity from the consequences of crime arising from the extended assertion of the principle led to many abuses, and by the legislature of Justinian those guilty of specified crimes were to find no right of asylum in the

<sup>21</sup> Cod. Theod. 1. 16, tit. 7. de Apostatis, leg. 4 (t. 6, p. 207). *Hi, qui sanctum fidem prodiderunt, et sanctum baptismum haeretica superstitione profanarunt, a consortio omnium segregati sint, etc.*

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. tit. 6. *Ne sanctum baptismum iteretur, leg. 4 (t. 6, p. 197). His, qui forsitan ad rebaptizandum cogentur, refugiendi ad ecclesiam catholicam sit facultas, ut ejus praesidio adversus hujus criminis auctores attributae liberatis praesidio defendantur.*

<sup>23</sup> Ep. 54-58. VIII.

churches. This seems to point to a specific concession on the part of the civil power. Legal refuge was in point of fact nothing but the intercession of the clergy for men in distress, and pending the issue of their efforts, the right to protect them from violence. A law of Justinian affirms this: "Templorum cautela non nocentibus, sed laesis datur a lege."

Boniface V., who became Pope in 609, enacted<sup>24</sup> that "criminals who fled to churches should not be taken thence by force." From the words 'quovis crimine patrato' it appears that no crime was bad enough to exclude a malefactor from the protection of the Church.<sup>25</sup> The same spirit is found in the "Decretum Gratiani," compiled in 1151.<sup>26</sup> By a capitular in 779, conformable to one of Carloman and Pepin passed about 744, Charlemagne decreed that churches should not be *asyla* for criminals who had committed such crimes as the law punished by death; and if the Emperor did not go so far as to make it lawful to force a criminal from his asylum, yet he prohibited people from giving them food. At the council at Clermont, during the primacy of St. Anselm, one decree of this council, which has a good deal of interest, might easily be forgotten. This is one which was meant to reform the abuses of the privileges of sanctuary: "Qui ad ecclesiam vel ad crucem confugerint, data membrorum impunitate, justitiae tradantur, vel innocentes liberentur."

As the ages advanced the bounds of any sanctuary extended, first from the church to the cloisters and cemetery. We hear about this specially in connection with the greater churches. William the Conqueror decreed that "his abbey of St. Martin of Battle, by his royal authority be given and granted the privilege of holding its own court, with royal liberties, and the right of negotiating its own affairs and the execution of justice. And if any person guilty of theft, manslaughter, or any other crime should, through fear of death, take refuge in this abbey (that is, within the Leuga), he should receive no injury, but depart entirely free. And if the abbot should chance, anywhere throughout the realm of England, to meet any (capitally) condemned thief, robber, or other criminal, he should be at liberty to release him from punishment."

In some cases the right of sanctuary extended for a few miles surrounding a church, and we find in some districts signposts to direct the refugee. At the present time one can be seen at Armathwaite, Cumberland, and another at St. Buryan's, Cornwall. During mediæval times there were several famous sanctuaries, which included St. Mary-le-Bow, Beaulieu, Wells, Ramsey, but none could

<sup>24</sup> Platina, "Vitae Pontificum."

<sup>25</sup> "Archaeologia," Vol. VIII., p. 10.

<sup>26</sup> Migne, "Patrologiae," tom. 16; "Regni Caesla," p. 1255.



boast of equal immunities with the Abbey of Croyland. The monastery, the island and the waters which surrounded it, enjoyed the right of sanctuary, and a line of demarcation, drawn at a distance of some twenty feet from the opposite margin of the lake, assisted the pursuit of the officers, and insured the safety of the fugitive. Immediately he took an oath of fealty to the abbot, and the *man* of St. Guttlake might laugh in security at the impotent rage of his enemies. But if, "without a written permission, he presumed to wander beyond the magic boundary, the charm was dissolved and justice resumed her rights."<sup>27</sup> The knocker on the north door at Durham Cathedral and at St. Gregory's, Norwich, are said to have been used by those who fled from their pursuers to rouse the watchmen, who were in readiness in the place above to let them in at any hour, and to toll the Galilee bell as public notice that some one had come in for sanctuary. On admission, the "grithman" received a gown of black cloth "maid with a yeallowe cloth called St. Cuthbert's Cross, sett on the lefte shoulder of the arme" and was permitted to lie "within the church or sanctuary in a grate . . . standing and adjoining unto the Galilei dore on the south side," and "had meite, cost and charge for 37 days." The writer of an old book alleges that maintenance was found for fugitives "unto such tyme as the prior and convent could gett them conveyed out of the dioces," but Mr. Forster traverses this statement and adduces documentary evidence to show that, in various instances, "grithmen" were permanently domiciled in the diocese. We have, however, an account of one such "conveyance." A certain Coleon de Wolsyngham, in the year 1487, on retiring from the church, was delivered by the Sheriff to the nearest constables, and after that by constables to constables, that he might be conducted to the nearest seaport, there to take shipping and never return. He is stated to have received a white cross made of wood. At the collegiate church at Beverley any one who sought refuge had food provided for him with a lodging in the precincts for thirty days, after which the privilege secured him as far as the borders of the county. The story goes that Athelstan, on his return from a victorious campaign against King Constantine, conferred the privilege on the Church of St. John and a portion of the surrounding country. In some churches there was a seat provided for the delinquent called the *fridstool* (peace stool): one is still preserved at Hexham Abbey; it is of Norman style and belongs to the twelfth century. In Prior Richard's history of Hexham it is stated that there were at that place four crosses, each

---

<sup>27</sup> This marked out the sanctuary ground—the king, Bishop and people. D. Archerz's "Irish Canons," Vol. IX. Lingard's "Anglo-Saxon Church," 2d E., 1810; p. 94.

of them erected at a distance of one mile from the church, and in a different direction. Any one who arrested a fugitive within these limits was fined two *hundredth*, or sixteen pounds. For an arrest "infra villam" the penalty was twofold. If the person were seized "infra muros atrii ecclesiae," it was threefold; and, if within the church itself, sixfold, to which was added penance "sicut de sacrilegiis." Supposing, however, that any one, "vesano spiritu agitatus diabolico ausu quemquam capere praesumpserit in cathedra lapidea juxta altare quam Angli vocant fridstol, id est, cathedram quietudinis vel pacis, vel etiam ad feretrum sanctarum reliquiarum quod est post altare," the crime was "botolos" (without remedy): no monetary payment could be received as compensation. When Leland was at Beverley, he was shown a frithstool, on which he made the following note: "Haec sedes lapidea Freedstool dicitur, i. e., Pacis Cathedra, ad quam reus perveniens omnimodam habet securitatem." There was a frithstool endowed with similar privileges at York Minster, and another at Durham. Stone seats claimed to be frithstools are still shown at Hexham and Beverley.

From a very early period of its history the Cistercian Order claimed the right of permanent sanctuary, and the statute setting forth the claim was duly confirmed by Pope Eugenius III. in 1152, and later by his successors, Celestine III. and Innocent. According to Dr. Cox the order never made any particular effort to attract seekers after safety in England, but contented itself with sternly upholding its privilege if ever occasion arose. Still, the Cistercian abbeys of the North were certainly known as sanctuaries, for Archbishop Peckham, in a letter written to Robert Malet in 1289 speaks of wrongdoers betaking themselves to the various abbeys of the order. A certain number of the *conversi* were doubtless recruited from this class, and after proving their penitence, were admitted and pledged to lifelong labor in the service of the community.

When Diarmaid, King of Ireland, was defeated by Hy-Neill at the battle of Culdremhne, in 561, the popular voice attributed his ill fortune to the fact of his having killed Curnan while under the protection of Columcille. The same Diarmaid violated the sanctuary of Ruadhan of Lothra, one of the twelve apostles of Ireland, and carried off by force to his fortress at Tara a person under Ruadhan's guardianship. By refusing to give him up, Diarmaid drew upon himself the curse of Ruadhan. For "Roadanus and a Bishop that was with him took the bells that they had, and cursed the king and palace, and prayed God that no king or queen ever after should dwell in Tarach, and that it should be waste forever, without court or palace, as it fell out accordingly"; or as an old Irish poem has it—

"From the judgment of Ruadhan on his house, there was no king at Teamrigh or Tara."

It may be mentioned that the foundation charter of the Abbey of Dumbrody, 1176 (Ireland), expressly states that the members are to harbor in security any fugitives who claimed their protection. So scrupulously was this observed in Ireland that the very necessities of life, under the shadow of the sanctuary, were deemed inviolable. On that account, Cardinal Vivian got leave for the English, about the year 1186, to have the provisions taken away from the sanctuaries into which the Irish had stowed them. Not only the sanctity of a place, but even the sacredness of a person ensured sanctuary. Feoris stole a bell from the church of Ballysidare. He put it on his head, in the hope that his connection with sanctuary, even by sacrilege, would protect him.<sup>28</sup> In the registry of Palatian, Archbishop of Armagh, reference is made to right of sanctuary.<sup>29</sup> The clergy made it a matter of complaint "that those who abjured the land, while in the public street and in the king's peace, were molested; and that the guardians of those who took refuge in a church should have remained in the cemetery." They did not complain when there was a necessity on the part of the guardians of remaining in the cemetery, or when there may be danger of the refugee's escape. In Article XI. they insisted that "the refugees should be allowed to confess their sins, and not be molested while proceeding to a confession."

Dr. Cox quotes from the annals of the Cistercian house of Waverley a notable example of the power wielded by the Church, armed with the power of sanctuary right, in the reign of Henry III. About Eastertide, 1240, there came to Waverley Abbey a young man, who announced himself as a shoemaker, and being admitted and proved of a devout mind, was put to his own trade in the service of the house. Until the following August all went well and peaceably. Then arrived a certain knight and his retinue who demanded the young shoemaker on a charge of homicide, and, in spite of the strong protests of the abbot and monks, seized upon him and carried him off. Thereupon the abbot laid an interdict upon his own church, with the consent of his brethren; no services were to be said until redress had been afforded and satisfaction made. The Papal Legate was at that time in England (Otto, Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina, who was here from 1237 to 1241), and to him the abbot applied. But the Legate was either remiss or lukewarm: the abbot went to the

---

<sup>28</sup> Bermingham was expressed in Irish by "Feoris" or "Peoris," because the principal man of the Berminghams was called Pierse. "Four Masters," *ad. an.* 1261.

<sup>29</sup> The registry refers to the laws passed in the Parliament at Lincoln, in the ninth year of Edward. We are to presume they were applied to Ireland.



King. The King was sympathetic, but his Council was not, and it was not until the abbot had promised to withdraw his interdict and resume his services that his petition was considered. But he was a man of persistence and determination, and in the end he won his case. It was formally declared that the enclosures of all Cistercian houses and granges were exempt by Papal authority from civil action, and that all persons violating their sanctuary were, ipso facto, excommunicate. Upon this, the young shoemaker was restored to the abbey; those who had haled him thence were made to appear at the gate; they were publicly whipped by one of the monks and the Vicar of Farnham, and that done, were absolved by the abbot, who doubtless mingled some sound advice with his forgiveness.

Sometimes, however, the pursuers braved the spiritual censures and laid violent hands upon the runaway. But it was a dangerous thing to do, so they kept watch outside. A porter in a church at Newcastle, Nicholas by name, who helped to seize one who had taken refuge there, was whipped at Durham in public for three days, and could only obtain pardon by the influence of the Pope's Nuncio. In the year 1378, the Constable of the Tower pursued a few men fugitives into sanctuary, and actually had the temerity to slay two of them in the church itself, before the prior's stall, and during the celebration of High Mass. This seems to be the most flagrant case of violation on record. The abbot closed the church for four months; the perpetrator of the murder was excommunicated; the guilty persons were very heavily fined; the abbot protested against the deed at the next meeting of Parliament; and the ancient privileges of St. Peter's Sanctuary were confirmed. There were other violations, specially in the lawless times of civil war. For instance, in the reign of Richard II., Tressilian, Lord Chief Justice, was dragged out of sanctuary; the Duke of York took John Holland, Duke of Exeter, out of sanctuary. On the other hand, Henry VII. was careful to respect sanctuary when Perkin Warbeck fled to Beaulieu Abbey. This was perhaps politic, and intended to show that he had nothing whatever to fear from that poor little pretender. *Inter alia*, it must be remembered that the whole privilege of sanctuary was closely connected with that known as benefit of clergy. If a malefactor took sanctuary, the four neighboring townships had to watch the church and prevent his escape; thus in 1221 the towns of Stone, Heath and Dunclent, near Kidderminster, failed in their duty.<sup>30</sup> About the year 1300 the bailiffs and coroners of Waterford caused the neighbors to be summoned to watch a church in which a criminal had taken refuge.<sup>31</sup> But exemptions were sometimes

<sup>30</sup> "History of English Law," Pollock and Maitland, I, p. 531; II, 588.

<sup>31</sup> "Borough Customs," ed. Rasteton, II, p. 34.

obtained. In 1340 the burgesses of Cardiff obtained exemption from the duty of watching fugitives who had fled to churches outside the walls of that town.<sup>32</sup> On one occasion a criminal took sanctuary in the church at Fosdike; the township was bound to watch the church until the coroner came; the coroner would not come for less than a mark; so the township had to watch the church forty days, to its great damage.<sup>33</sup>

The refugee was as often as not an habitual criminal, who might have broken out of prison on the eve of execution. Some light on this point is derived from the Northumberland Assize Rolls of the years 1256 and 1279. For instance: "Robertus de Cregling et Jacobus le Escoe', duo extranei, capti fuerunt pro suspicione latrocinii per ballivos Willelmi de Valencia et imprisonati in prisa ad ecclesiam de Rowebyr' et cognovit ibi latrocinium et abjuravit regnum coram Willelmo de Baumburg tunc coronatore."

Offenders were obliged to state the nature of the crimes alleged against them, and the Durham register shows that by far the largest number were murderers and homicides. Some claimed the rights of sanctuary for debt, some for stealing horses or cattle and burglary; and others for such crimes as rape, theft, harboring a thief, escaping from prison, failing to prosecute, and being backward in their accounts. Townships which failed to arrest the criminal after he had taken refuge in it, were fined by the King's Justices, the circumstances proving that the institution was tolerated as a necessary evil by those responsible for the maintenance of law and order—not regarded with favor.

The first authentic recorded cases in England are uncertain. Suspicion attaches to the legends which have been attributed to the Christian king, Lacius (180), who conferred the privilege of sanctuary upon the Church at Winchester. The earliest mention of sanctuary in England was a code of laws promulgated by King Ethelbert in 600. Sebert, the first Christian king of Essex (604), granted the right of sanctuary to the Church at Westminster. Stow in his "Survey of London" states that the privilege was "first granted by Sebert, king of the East Saxons, since increased by Edgar, king of the West Saxons, renewed and confirmed by King Edward the Confessor, as appeareth by this his charter following: 'Edward by the grace of God, king of Englishmen! I make it to be known to all generations of the world after me, that by special commandment of our Holy Father Pope Leo, I have renewed and honored the holy Church of the Blessed Apostle St. Peter, of Westminster, and

<sup>32</sup> "Cartae et Munimenta de Glamorgan."

<sup>33</sup> R. H. I. 308, quoted by Pollock and Maitland in "History of English Law," Vol. I., p. 566.

I order and establish forever that what person of what condition or estate soever he be, from whence soever he come, or for what offense or cause it be, either for his refuge into the said holy place, he be assured of his life, liberty and limbs, etc." Stow expressly states that this privilege belonged to "the church, churchyard and close," and not to any particular building.<sup>34</sup> In 690, Ina, King of Wessex, enacted that "if a person who has committed capital offenses shall fly to a church, he shall preserve his life and make satisfaction as right requires."

The laws of Alfred allow three days' sanctuary in the "mynster-ham," which is free from the king's farm, or any other free community, with a bot of 120 shillings for its violation, to be paid to the brotherhood; and seven days in every church hallowed by the Bishop, with the penalty of the king's "mund and byrd" and the Church's "frith" for its violation. The church ealdor is to take care that no one give food to the refugee. If he be willing to give up his weapons to his foes, then let them keep him thirty days, and give notice to his kinsmen (that they may arrange the legal bot). The three days allotted by the laws of Alfred were successively extended to a week, to nine days, and lastly to an indefinite period, which might be shortened or protracted at the discretion of the sovereign, but when it elapsed, the fugitive, unless he had previously satisfied the legal demands of his adversaries, was delivered to the officer of justice.<sup>35</sup> King Athelstan's laws further modify the right of sanctuary: a thief or robber fleeing to the king or to any church, or to the Bishop, is to have a term of nine days; if he flees to an ealdorman, or an abbot, or a thane, three days; and he who harbors him longer is to be worthy of the same penalty as the thief. The king's grith (protection) is to extend from his burhgate where he is dwelling, on its four sides three miles three furlongs and three acres breadth, and nine feet nine palms and nine barleycorns. A law of King Canute assigns different values of grith (protection) to the different kinds of churches, the grith bryce (penalty for violation of grith). The fugitive was under obligation to make reparation for his crime; and the Council of Mentz, in 813, decreed: "*Rerum confugientem ad ecclesiam nemo abstrahere audeat . . . tamen legitime comparat quod inique fecit.*" In the Anglo-Saxon code of laws the violation of Church grith is counted twice as serious as the breaking of the king's peace. The most ancient and famous sanctuary in England was that of Beverley, the immunities of which originated in a grant by Athelstan to St. John of Beverley after

<sup>34</sup> Stow's "Survey of London," Clarendon Press, Ed. 1908, Vol. II., pp. 111-12. This 1066 charter of the Confessor is supposed to be spurious.

<sup>35</sup> Wilk., "Leg. Sax.," p. 35.; II., 36; V. 110.



returning from his victory over the Danes at Brunamburg (937). Innocent III. (1198-1216) enjoined that refuge should not be given to a highway robber or to any one who devastated cultivated fields at night, and according to Beaumanoir's "*Coutumes du Beauvoisis*,"<sup>36</sup> dating from the thirteenth century, sanctuary was also denied to those who were guilty of arson or sacrilege. In 1209, venison having been found in the house of Hugh de Scot, he fled to a church in Shropshire, refused to leave it and lingered there a month. Afterwards he escaped in a woman's clothes.<sup>37</sup> Again, in 1232, when Hugh de Burgh was deprived of his office of justiciar, he betook himself to the chapel of Boisars, in Essex, where he was besieged by a military force, who surrounded the chapel by a palisade rampart.<sup>38</sup>

The Assize of Clarendon decreed that all persons of evil repute were required to quit the realm within eight days: "The Lord King wishes also that those who shall be tried and shall be absolved by the law, if they be of very bad testimony and are publicly and disgracefully defamed by the testimony of many and public men, shall forswear the lands of the king, so that within eight days they shall cross the sea, unless the wind detains them, and with the first wind which they shall have afterwards they shall cross the sea; and they shall not return any more to England unless by the mercy of the Lord King; and there, and if they return, shall be outlawed; and if they return, they shall be taken as outlaws."

The same fate was in store for any felon who deviated from the highway in proceeding to his assigned port. He might not, however, be reserved for judicial execution, being at the mercy of his captors, who could do as they pleased with him. "Some robbers indeed, as well as some thieves, are lawless—outlaws we usually call them—some not; they become outlaws, or lawless, moreover, when, being lawfully summoned, they do not appear, and are awaited and even sought for during the lawful and fixed terms, and do not present themselves before the law. Of these therefore the chattels and also the lives are known to be in the hands of those who seize them, nor can they for any reason pertain to the king."<sup>39</sup> ("*Dialogus de Scaccario*," x.)

In 1299, an appeal was made to the king by that strenuous diocesan, Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, to cause John le Berner, clerk, to be replaced by the sheriff in the Church of the

<sup>36</sup> XI., 15 ff.

<sup>37</sup> "Select Places of the Crown" (Seldon Society), XII., p. 9.

<sup>38</sup> "*Annals de Dunstaplia*," pp 129, 137-8.

<sup>39</sup> In Norman times the prosecutor was compensated twofold out of the chattels of the tried and convicted thief; the rest of his goods went to the King.

Austin Friars at Ludlow. John had fled there, when in fear of death, claiming immunity, but certain of the men of that town dragged him forth with violence, and after inflicting various injuries, loaded him with chains, and sent him to the castle of Shrewsbury, where he was still in gaol. The nature of John's alleged offense is not stated; the Bishop simply claims his release and replacement in sanctuary, in accordance with the laws of ecclesiastical liberty.<sup>40</sup>

The Coroner's Rolls for the city of York yield evidence as to the frequency with which town as well as country churches were visited by fugitives. Between 1349 and 1359 there were eleven such cases, which occurred in the parish churches of All Saints Pavement, St. Cross (2), St. Laurence, St. Martin Coney Street, St. Martin Micklegate (2), St. Saviour Holy Trinity, St. William-on-the-Bridge, and the conventual Church of the Carmelite Friars. In seven instances the crime was homicide, and in the remainder one form or other of robbery. The gravest case was the killing of Aldane, vicar of the Church of St. Laurence, Walmgate, by Stephen de Burton, chaplain; the criminal actually claimed sanctuary in the church of which his victim was incumbent.

In Edward III.'s reign (1327-77) the persons accused were allowed to flee the country provided they kept certain conditions—they had to keep to the king's highway, and travel with a wooden cross in their hands, barefooted and bareheaded and in coats only. They were not allowed to remain any two nights in the same place, and were only allowed nine days to reach Dover from Yorkshire; this abjuring of the realm involved forfeiture of everything they possessed. If they could find no passage over sea, the delinquent was bound each day to walk out knee-deep in the water in proof of his good will to make the passage. Large numbers of our felons were induced to relieve England of their presence and were shipped off at Dover to France or Flanders. One continental authority holds that the law of abjuration is developed from ancient English elements and passed from England to Normandy. It must have taken its permanent shape late in the twelfth century. While on such a journey it was decreed that the felon was to wear a costume which would cause him to be recognized as one who had taken sanctuary, and the king "forbade any one under pain of life and limb to kill them so long as they were on their road pursuing their journey." An officer branded them on the brawny part of the thumb with the letter "A," standing for the word "abjure," so that all men might know in what relation they stood henceforth to society.

Further the question of sanctuary was brought before the Parliaments of Gloucester (1378) and London (1379) on account of the

---

<sup>40</sup> Swinfield's "Register," 125b.

abuses of sanctuary privileges. John Wyclif thought that the Church and civil courts should keep their jurisdictions entirely separate; as previously both had quarreled concerning each other's right. But it was not until 1418 that the Pope Martin V. tried to regulate the question by a Bull. In 1450, during the Jack Cade rebellion, one of the fugitives fled to St. Martin-le-Grand. The chartulary of the famous church of St. Martin-le-Grand in London shows that its sanctuary privileges were supported by Innocent III. (1198-1216). Extracts "in a fifteenth century hand" are to be found in Brit. Mus. Lansdt. MSS. No. 170.<sup>41</sup> The king wrote to the dean of the church ordering him to produce the traitor. This the dean refused to do, and he exhibited his charters, which were found to be correct.

As an illustration of its efficacy, we may point to the story that after the battle of Tewkesbury, King Edward IV., with some of his knights, was about to enter the church, sword in hand, in pursuit of some of the defeated Lancastrians who had taken refuge there, when the priest met them at the door bearing the consecrated host, and refused them entrance till the king had promised pardon to several of the refugees. We frequently meet with examples of people in danger to life or liberty taking refuge in the nearest church.

The church was also a sanctuary for property. It was very usual to deposit money and valuables there for safe custody. Jews were not allowed to deposit their money and valuables in churches.

The following is of interest, and is taken from "*Liber Albus*" (Book III., pt. ii.), compiled in 1419 by one John Carpenter:

"Et si cheaunce nul felounn eschape jesques al moustier, einz qil soit prys, les gentz de le Garde ou le moustier serra en qi le felounn soit mys, facent le garde de celuy feloun, taunt qil eit fait lasser du realme, si les gentz de le Garde a ceo sufficient; et sinounn, eyent eyde des proscheins veisins et Garde joynauntz a celle Garde, solonc lordeinement et avisement del Gardeyn de la citee; issi qe nul ne soit de tiele garde desresonablement charge.

"Et le Roy voet qe touz entendent qe nulle fraunchise ne auncien usage eit lieu pur qoy qe cest estableiment ne soit tenuz. Et ceux qí del trespas serront attientz, come de bateries, ou de sank trete, ou mort ou mahaym ne gist, soient issi puniz par raunsoun; et nomenment par emprysonement, par la discrecioun de ceux devaunt queux le trespas serra jugge; qe la duresce de cel punicement done crente as autres de trespasser. Et touz voiez eient regarde a la quantite du trespas, et a ceo qils soient culpables et custumers de trespasser ou nounn.

<sup>41</sup> The first Papal Bull (on behalf of the above) is that of Alexander II., dated 1068; followed by confirmatory ones of Honorius II., Lucius II., Gregory VIII. and IX., Clement III. and IV., and John XXII.



"Et bien soy garde chescun de heu et de cry lever en affray de la citee de jour ou de noet, sanz resonable enchesoun. Et si nul face et de ceo soit attient, soit puny solom le trespas.

"Et si nul meffesour eschape hors du moustier, ceux qui le garde duissent faire soient tenuz au Roy en cent souldz pur leschape; et ceo soit entendu des eschapes hors des moustiers de la citee. Et des eschapes hors de Newgate, soient teux come avaunt furent."

Perhaps one of the most notable persons to claim sanctuary in the fifteenth century was Elizabeth Woodville, Queen of Edward IV., who took refuge at Westminster Abbey with her children from the hostility of Richard III., on October 1, 1470, when Thomas Meylling was abbot.

The Thucydidean speech of the Duke of Buckingham on the removal of the queen of Edward IV., with her younger son, the Duke of York, to the sanctuary of Westminster in 1483, furnishes a searching criticism of the use and abuse of this privilege in the practice of the fifteenth century. Addressing the Privy Council, he is represented to have said:

"And yet will I break no sanctuary; therefore, verily, since the privileges of that place and other like have been of long continued, I am not he that will go about to break them; and in good faith, if they were now to begin, I would not be he that should go about to make them. Yet will I not say nay, but that it is a deed of pity that such men as the sea or their evil debtors have brought in poverty should have some place of liberty to keep their bodies out of the danger of their cruel creditors; and also if the crown happen (as it hath done) to come in question, while either part taketh other for traitors, I like well there be some place of refuge for both. But as for thieves, of which these places be full, and which never fall from the craft after they once fall thereunto, it is again, as though those places give them not only a safeguard for the harm they have done, but a license also to do more."

One Christopher Brown fled from the town of Lezburn to the sanctuary of St. Cuthbert at Durham, on Saturday, July 26, 1477, begging with anguish, *Pecit cum instancia*, the safety and freedom of the saint. In 1487, Prior Selling, of Canterbury, was sent by Henry VII. to Pope Innocent VII. concerning the sanctuary laws. The Pontiff agreed that (1) if any person in sanctuary went out at night and committed trespass and mischief, and then go back again, he should forfeit all privileges; (2) that debtors were only protected and not their goods from their creditors; and (3) that when a person took refuge for treason the king might appoint him a keeper within the sanctuary. Further, Henry VIII. enacted in the twenty-sixth year of his reign that no person accused of high treason should

enjoy the privilege.<sup>42</sup> The Council at Pontefract, held during the Pilgrimage of Grace (1527), decreed that sanctuary should "save a man for all causes in extreme need, and the church for forty days, and further according to the laws as they were used in the beginning of the King's days." Any instance which tended to mitigate severity has a certain hold, and might serve to give the poor man a little protection against the rich. Such was the uprising of the rebels against Henry VIII. In the year 1546 the only valid "places of tuition" were Wells, Manchester, Westminster, York, Norwich, Derby, Launceston. In each of these places there was a governor who had to muster every day his men, who were not to exceed twenty in each town, and who had to wear a badge when they appeared out of doors.

When on Friday, August 29, 1522, the Curia went to greet Adrian VI. (previous to his coronation), he received the homage of the Cardinals, thanked them for the confidence they had shown in electing him, excused his late arrival, and begged them as a favor to promise not to shelter outlaws in their palaces and to renounce the right of sanctuary in deference to the law.<sup>43</sup>

At length in 1623 all right of sanctuary was abolished.<sup>44</sup> Certain shadowy rights still attach to the palace of Holyrood, in Scotland. In England, Whitefriars, or "Alsatia," had still a vague right to be claimed as an asylum.<sup>45</sup> The name "Alsatia" first occurs in Shadwell's plays, in Charles II.'s reign. So flagrant were the abuses here that the sovereign in 1697 abolished all the privileges and of the quasi-sanctuaries as well. These convenient retreats were situated at the Mint, Gray's Inn Lane by Baldwin's Gardens, Fleet Street by Salisbury Court, and a few others. But it was not until the time of George I.<sup>46</sup> that the asylum of St. Peter's at Westminster was demolished. Some church towers were used as sanctuaries. In 1716 the parishioners of Tingwell, in Shetland, had a tradition among them that after one had received sentence of death upon the Holme he obtained a remission, provided he made his escape through the crowd of people and touched the church steeple (tower) before any could lay hold of him.

In the Legislature of Sweden the last reference to this sacred privilege is found in a document dated 1528. In France it was abolished *par ordonnance sur le fait de la justice* in 1539; and in Spain it lingered on to the nineteenth century. The houses of ambassadors were sometimes quasi-sanctuaries. At Rome this right

<sup>42</sup> Stat. 26, c. 13, s. 2.

<sup>43</sup> Gregorovius, "Rome," Vol. VIII. pt. ii., p. 428.

<sup>44</sup> Stat. James I., c. 28.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Scott's "Fortunes of Nigel" and "Peveril of the Peak."

<sup>46</sup> 1723, 9 Geo., c. 28.

was finally denied by Innocent XI. (1767-89), and in 1682 the Spanish ambassador to the Vatican renounced all right of such even for his house. Four years later the English did the same. To the present day members of Parliament cannot be served with a writ or arrested within the precincts of the Houses of Parliament. Even during the Irish troubles in the "eighties" Parnell avoided arrest for some time by living within the building.

CLAUDE C. H. WILLIAMSON.

London, England.



## THE VICTORINES.

THE celebrated Abbey of St. Victor of Paris, which gave its name to the renowned school of theology and mysticism of which Hugh of St. Victor and Richard of St. Victor were the chief exponents, was founded by William of Champeaux and Guildinus, the first Abbot, in the beginning of the twelfth century. William was born at Champeaux in 1070, and became archdeacon and master of the great theological school of Notre Dame of Paris, where he was wearied with the enmity of his scholar Abelard, so he resigned this office in 1108 and retired to a lonely spot outside Paris, where he was joined by several others, among them Guildinus, and there they founded on the ruins of an old convent, dedicated to the holy martyrs, St. Victor of Marseilles, a house of Canons Regular of St. Victor of Paris, in 1110. They took the rule of St. Augustine, to which Guildinus added their own constitutions, founded on the Rule of St. Benedict. Both William and Guildinus gave most generously to the restoration of the building, enriching the church with gold and silver and splendid vestments and endowing it handsomely. King Louis le Gros, the royal founder; Gilbert, Bishop of Paris, and Bernard the dean of Paris, and many others contributed most liberally to the foundation.

William of Champeaux, who was the first prior, was made Bishop of Châlons sur Marne in 1113, and Guildinus succeeded him as prior, and in the following year when the monastery was raised to an abbey, he was chosen as the first abbot.

The rule which, as we just said, was a combination of the rules of SS. Augustine and Benedict was very strict: flesh-meat was only allowed in case of sickness: all who were not specially engaged in literary labors were obliged to do some manual work, and were forced to maintain the strictest silence while so engaged, and were only allowed to communicate with each other when imperative to do so by signs. The canons rose between 1 and 2 o'clock for Matins and Lauds, after which they sang the Little Office of Our Lady, and altogether the office lasted fully three hours. To prevent any member of the community falling asleep, one of the canons went through both sides of the choir from time to time with a book in his hand, and every canon had to make an inclination to him; if any one failed to do so, the book was placed upon his head, so that it fell to the ground, and the offender had to pick it up and carry it around. All the rules to the smallest details were very strict; the offices were nearly the same as those in the Benedictine Order.

The abbot was chosen for life, and after consulting the other canons, he selected a prior and sub-prior. The habit was a robe of white serge, over which was worn a short, white gown which reached to the knees; to this was added in summer a short, black cape edged with fur: in winter a black cloak with a capuce covering the head. When the canons went out, they wore a black cloak and hat. In early times their heads were completely shaven except for a ring of hair round the crown. The lay brothers, afterwards abolished, wore a black habit with a girdle.

The celebrated theological school of the abbey was governed by one of the canons, Thomas, who was the first master. He was murdered and succeeded by the most celebrated of all the Victorines, Hugh of St. Victor, who with Richard of St. Victor founded this school of Christian mysticism. The other great work of the Victorines was cloister reform, and it was their zeal in this direction which ultimately, as the times grew slacker, caused their downfall. This began by one of the abbots endeavoring to introduce the custom of pontificating, to which the other canons objected as contrary to the spirit of the order. This was Heribert, abbot of St. Génévieve of Paris; the other canons separated themselves from him in consequence, and their precedent was followed by other convents of the order, where the abbots tried to introduce the custom, for which nevertheless they appear to have had some justification. Political circumstances in France at that time helped to the downfall of the congregation at Paris, but it was re-erected in 1515, but only to fall again under the Huguenots; then it was once more restored and finally was brought to an end by the French Revolution.<sup>1</sup>

Guildinus, the first abbot and co-founder, was a Frenchman, a native of Paris, and evidently a very rich man, as he gave so generously to the foundation. He held the office of abbot for forty-four years, during which time many rich and learned men joined the congregation, among them the celebrated Hugh of St. Victor and the great mediæval poet and sequence-maker, Adam of St. Victor. Guildinus was confessor to King Louis-le-Gros.

Under Guildinus also lived Thomas, the first master of the Theological School of St. Victor, and prior. He was also penitentiary and vicar-major to Stephen, Bishop of Paris. He was murdered in 1140 by the nephews of Theobald, Archbishop of Paris, whom in the name of Stephen the Bishop he had rebuked for simony. He was a most holy man, and much regretted by the other canons;

---

<sup>1</sup> Heimbucher. *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Kat. Kirche.*

his murderers were excommunicated by Bishop Stephen, who reserved to himself the right of absolving them if they repented.

Guildinus died in 1155, having ruled the monastery wisely and well for forty-four years, and was a very old man at the time of his death. In the Catalogue of Ferrarius, he is called "blessed," but in the Victorine necrology he is only called, "our venerable Father Guildinus, first abbot of this church, a man of great authority and holiness. He having zeal for God and the order restored the Order of Canons, which was almost extinct. In his days our house was the first of our order and by the prerogative of religion shone far and wide like a most brilliant star."<sup>2</sup>

He was succeeded by Achard, afterwards Bishop of Avranches, an Englishman, a native of Bridlington according to some writers,<sup>3</sup> others say he was a Norman of noble birth. He was a very good man and very learned. He distinguished himself in many branches of knowledge. As a young man he excelled in philosophy, and in mature age in theology, and he made great progress in both. At length, weary with the unrest of the world, he joined first the Cistercians at Clairvaux, later the Canons Regular of St. Victor, and succeeded Guildinus as abbot. The English Pope, Adrian IV., sent him many letters, which rather points to his having been an Englishman. He wrote several works while abbot, including a good many sermons. In 1162, after leading a very strict life as canon and abbot, he was called to the Bishopric of Avranches by Henry II. This appointment greatly displeased King Louis of France, who wrote to the Canons of St. Victor, forbidding the new Bishop to have anything more to do with the abbey, which he professed to love exceedingly.

Achard lived an exemplary life as Bishop for ten years, endowing the religious houses in his diocese largely, especially that of the Premonstratensian Abbey of the Holy Trinity, which he greatly loved and frequently visited, and in which he was buried at his death in 1172.

A quaint old Latin verse found in a Victorine MS. calls him "the glory of the English clergy and an olive-branch of that house, who lived to a good old age, and from that sheepfold was called to be Bishop of Avranches."<sup>4</sup>

The third abbot was Ernisius or Ernest, also an Englishman, but unfortunately a very worldly-minded man. During his abbacy, Richard of St. Victor was master of the Theological School of St. Victor, in which office he had succeeded Hugh of St. Victor, and

---

<sup>2</sup> Migne, *idem.*, pp. 1366-1371.

<sup>3</sup> Heimbucher.

<sup>4</sup> Migne, pp. 1371-1374.



it was due to him that the discipline of the abbey was not relaxed, though according to one account abuses had crept in, under Ernisius. Another account says that Ernisius refused to consult the older and wiser canons concerning the management of the house, and he was evidently too autocratic, for after his resignation a rule was introduced that no changes should be made in the administration, inside or outside the convent, without consulting the elder brothers in council.

Ernisius was advised by Stephen, Bishop of Paris, to resign the office of abbot, and he was forced to take this advice and then retired to another house of the Canons of St. Victor at St. Paul's, near Caprodia, in Italy, as prior, but he was forced to resign this office also by the Archbishop and Bishop Stephen of Paris.

He died in 1175-76, three or four years after his resignation. We are not told what part of England he came from, but probably from the Diocese of Hereford, as the Bishop of Hereford wrote to him to send him one of his canons as parish priest of a church in his diocese, whose priest had lately died.

Ernisius was evidently a man of means and position, for in 1165 he stood sponsor with two other abbots to Philip, son of King Louis VII. of France, who afterwards succeeded his father as King, under the title of Philip Augustus. From this fact and also from another incident, Ernisius appears to have been on excellent terms with Louis, for the Cardinal Legate of the Apostolic See asked the powerful Abbot of St. Victor to beg the King to allow him faculties to return to his brother Cardinals. Ernisius replied that he had had a secret and familiar interview with the King, who had cordially given the Legate permission to return to his brother Cardinals when and where he pleased.

Ernisius was evidently unpopular, for in 1169, Pope Alexander III. wrote to King Louis, grieving to hear that the discipline in the abbey of St. Victor had relaxed, and begging the King to stretch out a helping hand to those who needed it in the same abbey, "for there were many there who had a knowledge and love of religion, but there were certain members who with the head of the community had grown tepid." The Pope also wrote to the Archbishop and Bishop Stephen, and the abbot of Valla-secreta "that they should apply the medicine they found necessary to this evil." Ernisius without having any discussion with the Bishops resigned at once, in April, 1172.

The date of his death is uncertain, nor are we told where he died: he is mentioned in the Necrology of St. Victor as dying in the month of May, and the time is believed to have been three or

four years after his abdication. He was succeeded as abbot by Guarinus,<sup>5</sup> who ruled the abbey from 1172 to 1192. Ernisius seems to have had some enemies, for soon after the accession of Guarinus, Maurice, then Bishop of Paris, wrote to the Archbishop, accusing the late abbot of having taken some of the treasure belonging to the monastery away with him. The Archbishop replied, that on going to the abbey in the presence of Guarinus and the other canons, be found on examining the chests and repositories that the golden chalices and other things that by right belonged to it were all there, assigned to the abbot and his brothers by Ernisius.

Apparently there was an outbreak of plague or some disease in the abbey, the year after the accession of Guarinus, for when Alexander III. and one of his Cardinals, who was a Canon of St. Victor, wrote to the abbot, begging him to let the Cardinal and his chaplain, who was also a Canon of St. Victor, go to him, Guarinus at first acceded to the request, but afterwards wrote to say he was obliged to refuse, because he had lost by sickness several members of his congregation, and among them the celebrated Richard of St. Victor, who was the prior and master of the theological school. The grief of Guarinus at this loss was mitigated by the promotion of another canon of his house to the Cardinalate. Under Guarinus another celebrated canon, Adam the poet and sequence-writer, died. Another poet and canon who flourished under him was Leonius, who, by the advice of Guarinus, turned the five books of Moses and the seven books of the history of the Kings of Israel into Latin verse, which are still extant in MS., in which condition they are likely to remain.

Nothing proves the fame of the monastery of St. Victor more than the fact that so many of its members were made Cardinals and Bishops. Bishop Stephen of Paris, whom we have mentioned several times, was originally a canon of St. Victor, and he ultimately retired to the Abbey of St. Victor of Paris to die.

Guarinus died in 1192, having labored much, we are told, in restoring the losses which Ernisius had brought upon the house. His epitaph on his tomb in the monastery describes him as "a religious and eloquent man, the light of the Roman world, a famous doctor, endowed with the heavenly gifts of wisdom and contemplation."<sup>6</sup>

Richard of St. Victor, the greatest of the Victorines after Hugh, was a voluminous writer: his works may be divided into two classes, exegetical and theological. His writings, as we should expect,

---

<sup>5</sup> Migne, pp. 1175-1179.

<sup>6</sup> Migne, 1379-1382.

seeing that he was one of the founders of the great school of mystical theology of St. Victor, are exceedingly mystical: they may be divided into two classes, exegetical and theological. His best known works are "Benjamin Minor" and "Benjamin Major," both of which treat of contemplative prayer; Benjamin, "a youth in ecstasy of mind," being taken by Richard as the type of contemplation. The smaller work, "Benjamin Minor," concerns the preparation of the soul for contemplation.<sup>7</sup> "Benjamin Major" deals with the grace of contemplation: it is in five books and is based on an allegorical explanation of the Ark of the Tabernacle of Moses. He also wrote some tracts, explaining this tabernacle of the Covenant, one of which was dedicated to St. Bernard. Another long work was "Mystical Notes on the Psalms" and a mystical interpretation of the Canticle of Canticles, another of the Canticle of Habacuc, and an interpretation of the Vision of Ezekiel, which last is illustrated by architectural drawings.

The most celebrated of his theological works are his two treatises on the Holy Trinity. He also wrote a long explanation in seven Books of the Apocalypse of St. John, and other minor works, all of a mystical nature. He was a disciple of the equally celebrated Hugh of St. Victor, who died in 1140. Hugh succeeded the first prior and master of the theological school of St. Victor, Thomas, who, as we have said, was murdered, and under the guidance of Hugh the school reached a very high standard; a few years after his death, Richard was made prior and master of the theological school, and held these offices until his death in 1172, under the Abbot Guarinus. Under Richard the theological school reached the acme of its fame.

His immediate predecessor as prior was Odo, who succeeded Hugh and held the offices of prior and master until 1147, when he was promoted to the abbacy of the celebrated monastery of St. Génévieve of Paris. He lived to a good old age and died in 1166; he left no literary remains beyond some letters and sermons. He was brought back to St. Victor's and buried there; his epitaph describes him as "meek as Moses, faithful as Nathanael, holy like Samuel, and anxious as Simeon."

Godfrey of St. Victor, who two years after the death of Richard, succeeded him as prior in 1174, was a Frenchman. He was master of sacred literature in the University of Paris, but desiring to lead a stricter life, he entered the Abbey of St. Victor as a novice under Ernisius in 1170, and four years later, under Gualterus, was made prior.

<sup>7</sup> See "Irish Ecclesiastical Record," August, 1916: "Benjamin Minor," translated by Darley Dale.



Some of his former friends in the world taunted him and another canon with having left the world to lead an idle and useless life in a monastery. To disprove the truth of this accusation, he wrote an enormous work in three volumes called "*De Microcosmo*," the prologue of which gave copious reasons for the step he had taken, explaining at great length the rationale of the *Canons Regular*. He divided the work itself into three parts, treating of the various qualities of the soul; first, the natural gifts, such as the arts and sciences; secondly, its mortal and deadly qualities, such as the vices which are given to it to subdue, and thirdly, its spiritual gifts or the virtues, which are compared with the six days of creation, with Charity or the seventh day as the root from which all the other virtues spring. He also wrote another book called "*De Philosophia*," dedicated to Stephen, then abbot of St. Génévieve of Paris. This was written in verse, every four lines ending in the same rhyme. He held the office of sub-prior till 1186, and died in 1194. Presumably he resigned the office of prior when he felt he was getting too old to hold it.

One of the greatest ornaments of this celebrated abbey was Adam, Canon of St. Victor, a contemporary of Hugh of St. Victor. He was an Englishman, a learned and very humble man, and one of the best poets of the Middle Ages. He wrote a book explaining the Prologue to St. Jerome's work of translating the Bible, without the help of which, according to an old author, it would have been impossible to understand the said prologue. But Adam's great claim to fame rests on his beautiful sequences or proses, of which he wrote a great number.

Three on the Holy Spirit are specially beautiful, one on the Holy Trinity and several on our Blessed Lady are some of his best, others were dedicated to the Apostles. Perhaps his prose for the Feast of the Assumption, "*Salve Mater Salvatoris*," his hymn to the Holy Spirit, "*Lux jucunda, lux insignis*," and a hymn for the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity, "*Splendor Patris et figura*," are his finest, but he was a true poet. He was a musician as well as a poet, and his poetry was so musical that his fault, common to mediæval poets, of being too fond of playing on words, may well be forgiven him.

The date of his death is uncertain. He wrote his own epitaph, in which he called himself "the poor and miserable Adam who begs one prayer, for he has sinned and begs God and his father-abbot and his brethren to forgive him." The latest German critic, Blume,<sup>8</sup> in his "*Sequentiæ ineditæ*," considers that the real name of Adam was

---

<sup>8</sup> Heimbucher. *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Kat. Kirche*.

Hamelius, a Canon of St. Victor, who died in 1192. At any rate he called himself Adam in his epitaph: "Hic ego qui jaceo miser et miserabilis Adam," and both he and his mediæval biographer compared him to his namesake, our first parent, and for seven and a half centuries the great mediæval poet and sequence-writer has been known as Adam of St. Victor, so why begin to call him Hamelius now?

The greatest of all the Victorines, whom we have reserved for the last, was Hugh of St. Victor, although he has only recently received due acknowledgment, it having been left to modern critics to recognize his merits as a philosopher, a theologian and a mystic. He was born in 1096 at Hartingham in Saxony, according to the latest researches, but Mabillon says his birthplace was Ypres in Flanders. He was the eldest son of Conrad, Count of Blankenburg. He took the habit at the monastery of the Canons Regular of Hamerleve, near Halberstadt. His uncle, the Bishop of Halberstadt, advised him to leave Hamerleve and go to St. Victor's of Paris, because of the unsettled state of the country in his diocese; accordingly, in 1115, he became a novice at St. Victor's of Paris, the monastery he was to render so famous for its theological and mystical teaching. A few years later Hugh was made prior under Guildinus, the first abbot, and master of the theological school attached to the monastery, which offices he held until his death, which took place on March 11, 1141. He wrote on all the known arts and sacred sciences of his day, but mainly on philosophy, theology and mysticism. As a philosopher it is now considered that he deserves a place among the scholastics. As a theologian, Harnack says of him, "that he was the most influential theologian of the twelfth century." He combated successfully some of Abelard's erroneous views on theology. His chief works are:

1, "De Sacramentis Christianæ Fidei"; 2, "De Eruditione Didascalica," in seven books; 3, "Commentaries on Holy Scripture"; 4, "Commentary on the Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite." His principal mystical works are: 1, "De Arce Noe Morali et Mystica"; 2, "Soliloquium de Arrha Animæ"; 3, "De Vanitate Mundi"; 3, "De Contemplatione et ejus Specibus."

The "Summa Sentiarum" is sometimes ascribed to him, but this is disputed. The key to the whole of his teaching is that man by the use of reason can and must arrive at the knowledge of God. He taught that mere knowledge was not an end in itself, but merely a stepping-stone to the mystical life. He divided mental prayer into three parts, which he called the three eyes of the soul: 1, Thought, which seeks God in the material world; 2, Meditation, which dis-

cerns Him in ourselves, and 3, Contemplation, which knows Him experimentally and intuitively. His mystical teaching, and especially that on contemplation, was very much enlarged by Richard of St. Victor in his mystical treatises on contemplation called "Benjamin Minor" and "Benjamin Major." Both Hugh and Richard were handicapped by their mediæval love of the allegorical interpretation of Holy Scripture, which, when the reaction set in against this tendency, caused later critics to underrate Hugh's gifts as a philosopher and a theologian, but more recent criticism has given him a very high place among both philosophers and theologians, while as a mystical teacher, no one stands higher, unless it be St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross.

The explanation of the Augustinian Rule and the directions to novices in the library, were used by almost all the Congregations of Secular Canons, and the customs of the Abbey of St. Victor were adopted by the Congregation of the Canons of Vallis Scholarium, as well as by the Premonstratensians and the numerous Augustinian orders.

Hitherto we have only spoken of the abbots and greatest luminaries of the Victorines; some of the lesser lights<sup>9</sup> when the abbey was in its prime, as it was in the days of Hugh and Richard, may fitly be mentioned. One of these was Walter of St. Victor, who died in 1180, and distinguished himself by writing a treatise against the teaching of Abelard. A contemporary of this last was Leonius, who wrote a history of the Old Testament in Latin verse.

Better known was Peter Comestor,<sup>10</sup> or the Devourer, so called because he read and digested so many books. He was born at Troyes in the twelfth century, and was made dean of that city, then for five years he directed the School of Theology at Paris, and then retired to the Abbey of St. Victor, where he died in 1178 or 1185. He wrote the "*Historica Scholastica*," which was published at Utrecht in 1173 and later in Paris, in two volumes. It is an abridgment of Holy Scripture with glosses in the margin from both profane and sacred authors. It was a most popular work among theological scholars in the Middle Ages. These summaries of both the Old and New Testaments were favorite subjects with early mediæval writers, both in verse and in prose, and served a very useful purpose in the days before the printing-press made the Holy Bible accessible to all who could read.

A century or two later than Peter Comestor and his contemporaries, we have John of Paris, 1322 (not to be confounded with the Dominican John of Paris who died in 1307), the Victorine who

<sup>9</sup> Heimbucher.

<sup>10</sup> Bouillet *Dictionnaire Historique*.



wrote a history of the times of Popes Clement V. and John XXII., called "*Memoriale Historiarum*," a valuable work on these two celebrated Popes. It will be remembered that it was Clement V. who removed the residence of the Popes from Rome to Avignon. John XXII. was learned both in jurisprudence and medicine; he left behind him several treatises on medicine. His strenuous opposition to the anti-Pope Nicholas V. and his drastic treatment of the Bishop of Cahors, whom he suspected of trying to poison him, his struggles with Louis of Bavaria in favor of the French, made him an admirable subject for a biography, of which John of Paris appears to have taken due advantage.

About the same time, Robert of Flamesbure, of the same congregation, lived and left behind him a "*Liber Pœnitentialis*." Then there was a French canon, Grenier, who wrote in his own language a book which was much read called "*The Shield of Faith*," in dialogue form, besides other works. A still more celebrated writer, a member of this congregation, was Thomas (Gadius) of Vercelli; he was a mystic, and after he became a canon of St. Victor was a teacher in the theological school there, until he was chosen by Cardinal Guara of Bichieri to be abbot of the Congregation of Canons of St. Victor, which he had just founded at Vercelli.

The cathedral library at Vercelli<sup>11</sup> contains some very valuable MSS., we may remark in parenthesis; among them is a fourth century copy of the Gospels and the celebrated Vercelli Book or Codex. At the beginning of the nineteenth century this Codex was believed to be an old English MS.; it consists of ten MSS., three of which are homilies, and the rest are in verse. The Englishman Cynewulf is said to be the author of one of these poems, called "*Elene*," and of another called the "*Fates of the Apostles*."

To return for a moment to St. Victor's of Paris, where the library used to be thrown open three times a week, for the use of the public, it was renowned for its splendid collection of valuable MSS. These have now been removed to the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris for the most part, the remainder being in the Bibliothèque at the Arsenal.

When Louis VIII. died, in 1226, he left in his will £100 to each of the forty houses of these Canons in France, and £1,000 to the town of Senlis in order that a new abbey for the canons might be built there. The congregation also spread to Germany, where they had a house at Springiersbach on the Moselle, and to Ireland, where they had two houses, one at Dublin and the other at Tuam, County Galway.

---

<sup>11</sup> Harmsworth's Encyclopedia.

The Abbot of St. Victor in Paris used to summon all the other abbots of St. Victor every year to a general chapter at the mother-house in Paris, until the first downfall in the fourteenth century.

Here we conclude this brief sketch of this celebrated congregation which produced so many holy and learned men, two of whom, Richard and Hugh of St. Victor, have been brought before a certain section of readers lately, owing to the modern revival of the study of mysticism, in which they were adepts.

DARLEY DALE.

Stroud, England.

## SIR JOHN MOORE (1761-1809) AND THE IRELAND OF 1798

EVERY reader of poetry in English knows "The Burial of Sir John Moore," composed in 1816 by the Rev. Charles Wolfe,<sup>1</sup> in the rooms of a Trinity College, Dublin, friend; the suggestion coming to the poet by his reading in the *Edinburgh Annual Register* an account of the death of the English Commander-in-Chief, this Scotsman, dead in his saving of his army at Corunna, 1809, after the forced 250 miles march north, flying from the armies of Napoleon and Soult.

Wolfe himself lies buried at Clonmel, just above the Cove of Cork. Wolfe's poems have been edited by the late C. Litton Falkiner; but by this poem he is known, and by it he has kept known, to the world at large, the brave subject of his story. "The Burial of Sir John Moore" was published anonymously in the *Newry Telegraph*. And it is with Ireland that we may willingly, as we shall see, connect this English general in the Ireland of 1798.

Byron's friends thought that Byron had composed the elegy. He was sorry he had not. He read it to Shelley, who said: "I should have taken the whole for a rough sketch of Campbell's." And Byron himself judged it "such an ode as only Campbell could have written"—he who wrote:

"But Linden saw another sight,  
When the drums beat at dead of night  
Commanding fires of death to light  
The darkness of her scenery."

and

"By this the storm grew loud apace,  
The water-wraith was shrieking;  
And in the scowl of Heaven each face  
Grew dark as they were speaking.

"But still as wilder blew the wind,  
And as the night grew drearer,  
Adown the glen rode armed men,  
Their trampling sounded nearer."

There is less storm and stress in the "Burial," less of the battle's light of fires and umbered faces, and of the lark cloud masses over

<sup>1</sup> It need hardly be said that the "French original, of Lally-Tollendal" is only one of the Rogueries of Father Prout (v. "Bentley's Miscellany," 1837, for this translation into French, republished in "Father Prout's Works.") A few years since, a Mr. Henry H. Hall once more "discovered" this original, and was famous, for a day, in the New York "Critic" and "Evening Post." Pity that his ignorance was exposed so soon, else he might have "discovered" the "Rogueries of Tom Moore!"



the Highland loch. But are not tone and taste perfect in picture and in action, here?—

“We buried him darkly at dead of night,  
The sods with our bayonets turning;  
By the struggling moonbeam’s misty light  
And the lantern dimly burning.

“No useless coffin enclosed his breast,  
Not in sheet or in shroud we wound him;  
But he lay like a warrior taking his rest,  
With his martial cloak around him.”

“Perfect!” was Byron’s note on this last stanza. (That rough cloak is now in the Tower of London.)

As to the dead night-time, an astronomer royal, in prose, Sir R. Ball, calculated that the moon would have been long below the horizon. However, in fact—if it matters—Colonel Graham, on the spot, knew that “a grave was dug in the centre of the bastion of the citadel where poor Anstruther<sup>2</sup> lay, and here at 8 o’clock in the morning the General’s body, without a coffin, was interred.”

He was forty-seven. From this rampart at Corunna his body was removed to near the sea under the bastion of San Carlos:

JOANNES MOORE  
EXERCITUS BRITANNICI DUX  
PROELIO OCCISUS  
A. D. 1809

Had it not been for that death, Soult’s army, some hold, would have been wholly defeated. The “victory” meant, at least, that the remains of the English army safely embarked. Napoleon, on his side, maintained that Moore’s “talents and firmness alone saved the British army (in Spain) from destruction.” The present tomb over what was Sir John Moore was said to have been built by Soult, his enemy in time—“The guns of the enemy paid his funeral honors, and Soult with a noble feeling of regard for his valor,” (so wrote Sir William Napier in his “History of the Peninsular War”) “raised a monument to his memory.” Yet, later accounts declare it to have been built by Romana, the general of the Spaniards.

The interest the poet excites in the fine memorial verses, and the admiration, are not misplaced for the whole life of high and generous patriotism and justice, of this “Happy Warrior.” The Napiers, quoted below, give their good hearts to him. And their praise is not domestic, merely, but is praise in war.

It is true the Duke of Wellington said: “I never in my whole life saw a man who had acted at all with troops, understand so little

<sup>2</sup> Moore’s friend, who had died on the day that the broken down army reached Corunna.

about them." And a Spanish commander, says Lady Holland (who "listens to all that is said against Moore, even by defeated and discredited Spaniards and discontented English") "ascribes the ruin and dispersion of his army to Sir John Moore." She seems, to some, to suggest that Moore threw his life away: "Moore has closed the mouths of his accusers, and sought the only exculpation left to him." He had been called, by some of his friends, "the unlucky man," for that he had been so often wounded. Wellington called him so once. Still Moore's final retreat did draw Napoleon after him; broke Napoleon's plan of campaign; and, whatever may have been the cause—the Austrian menace or other—Napoleon was then leaving Spain to his generals, and to France's defeat.

Oman's "History of the Peninsular War" lays stress on mistakes made by Moore. He did "make a few mistakes," said Napoleon, who added that they "were probably inseparable from the difficulties with which he was surrounded." "He was a brave soldier and an excellent officer." And, letting us see the fine stuff of the man, Wellington—as Sir A. Wellesley—had written to Moore, in 1808: "I told Lord Castlereagh that you thought the Government had not treated you well, and that you felt it incumbent on you to express your sentiments on that treatment, but that after you had done so, you thought no more of the matter, and that it would be found that you would serve as cordially and zealously in any situation in which you might be employed as if nothing had ever passed."

Of course, on that terrible winter flight over mountains, there were losses to his men, as from a battle—6,000 out of 25,000. The French seem to have lost only 2,000 out of 7,000 in the succeeding battle which they did not win. The weight on his dying mind found expression in: "I hope my country will do me justice." All his life he seems to have suffered from those misunderstandings already alluded to; court intrigue was against him, and the Tory party. His death did not keep the storm of what has been called by his defenders "civilian ignorance and political misrepresentation" from breaking over the name and fame of Sir Charles Napier's (1782-1853) "King of men—this high-minded, just, courteous and benevolent soldier, loved by all who served under him"; whom the historian brother, Sir William Napier (1785-1860) leaves with the tribute, "No insult could disturb, no falsehood deceive him, no remonstrance shake his determination; fortune frowned without subduing his constancy; death struck, and the spirit of the man remained unbroken when his shattered body scarcely afforded it a habitation. Having done all that was just towards others, he remembered what was due to himself. . . . If glory be a distinction for such a man, death is not a leveler."

Both the brothers, sons of Lady Sarah Lennox (Napier), aunt of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, had served with Moore, and like their commander, spoke in scorn of the Ascendancy and the Government policy in Ireland; their "merciless policy of fear," blind hate, and cunning, and ferocity.

Moore had been in Parliament from 1784 to 1790, after his youthful service (like Lord Edward's) in the American colonies. Sir Charles Napier wrote of what was his demeanor in actual battle:

—"when doomed to go in company with Pain,  
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!"—

"Again"—and this was at Corunna itself—"Sir John Moore returned, and was talking to me, when a round shot struck the ground between his horse's feet and mine. The horse leaped round, and I also turned mechanically, but Moore forced the animal back, and asked me if I was hurt. 'No, sir.' Meanwhile a second shot had torn off the leg of a Forty-second man, who screamed horribly and rolled about so as to excite agitation and alarm with others. The general said: 'This is nothing, my lads; keep your ranks. My good fellow, don't make such a noise; we must bear these things better!' He spoke sharply, but it had a good effect, for this man's cries had made an opening in the ranks, and the men shrunk from the spot, although they had not done so when others had been hit who did not cry out. But again Moore went off and I saw him no more."

When his turn then came, this commander over others practiced what he had to preach; he behaved, then, with great self-control; he did not even show that he felt pain; his mind was set on the fight, on the thought of victory.

A letter published only at the centenary, in 1909, tells:

"I was the only officer present at the moment our gallant chief received the fatal wound. . . . His sufferings were soothed by the shouts of victory; and an honorable life was terminated with a hero's death. . . .

"I was pointing out the situation of . . . a battalion in action; and (in the earnestness of conversation) touching his horse, when a cannon-shot from the enemy's battery carried away his shoulder, leaving his left arm hanging by the flesh. The violence of the fracture threw him off his horse on his back. I dismounted, and, with the assistance of a soldier near me, carried—or rather dragged—this undaunted character behind a stone wall a few yards distant, for the fire in this part of the action was extremely hot. . . .

"His countenance underwent not the least change. He grasped my hand, and, when I asked if he would be transported in a blanket, he assented in a very distinct tone of voice. His sword being in the way, in lifting him into it, I was in the act of unbuckling it from his waist, when, in a calm, mild manner, he



said, 'It is as well as it is; I had rather it should go out of the field with me.' . . .

"'Anderson,' he said, 'you know I have always wished to die in this way.'"

Ten years before, Sir John Moore had been in Ireland, the Ireland under the poet Campbell's

men who had trampled and tortured and driven

To rebellion the fairest isle breathed on by Heaven,

the Ireland of Lord Gosford's Armagh where (to use that county lord lieutenant's words) a persecution was raging—and two years before the rebellion—sparing neither age nor sex, for the crime, as Lord Gosford notes, of professing or being suspected of professing the Roman Catholic faith;<sup>3</sup> where some 5,000 people, Curran's evidence maintained, were wandering homeless, besides those burned in their cottages, or dying of starvation; and no satisfaction, no protection. Nay, the penal faction showing themselves, in Grattan's words, "a banditti of murderers, committing massacre in the name of God, and exercising despotic power in the name of liberty," were supported by magistrates and aided by highest officers of the "law." The Ireland, too, of the Wexford of Miles Byrne, whose "Notes of an Irish Exile of 1798" begin by saying that he was "forced" to take part in the insurrection movement after 1796; "because it was impossible to remain neutral." He takes a proof of that impossibility from his own uncle and cousin, the Breens, "both shot in cold blood," "and in the presence of my aunt and her daugh-

---

<sup>3</sup> Edward Hay, anti-revolutionary, writes—in his "History of the Irish Rebellion"—as to 1795, when "a description of public disturbers calling themselves Orangemen who now made their first appearance in the County of Armagh. . . . They posted up on the doors of the Catholics, peremptory notices of departure, . . . in a week at the farthest: 'To hell or to Connaught with you, bloody papists; and if you are not gone by' (mentioning the day) 'we will come and destroy yourselves and properties: we all hate the papists here.' They generally were as good as their words. The Catholics at first saved themselves by flight." (p. 42.)

When those offering for abandoned lands would give only half what the exiled gave, there was a meeting of landholders at which Lord Gosford presided, December 28, 1795, speaking in the terms noted. "The misplaced terms of 'loyal men' and 'loyal Protestant'" —writes the (of course) Protestant son of Grattan, in the memoirs of his father—"procured indemnity for outrage, impunity to crime, and became the only passport, and a sure protection." In this, our day, the Protestant Sir T. W. Russell's "Ireland and the Empire," (p. 266) exclaims: "Protestant forsooth! . . . The public house is their temple . . . they preach a gospel of hate that would disgrace a race of savages. . . . The spirit of the thing is everywhere throughout Ulster. . . . Hatred of Popery and even of Papaists is everywhere." "A bigotry," says Sir Horace Plunket's "Ireland in the New [Twentieth] Century," "notorious in the exclusion of all Roman Catholics from any responsible positions." "Your old taskmasters—I dread their recall," Grattan himself said to the Irish Catholics, when Fitzwilliam was recalled, and Presbyterians and then Catholics were about to revolt, in enthusiasm or in despair, against "that combination which galled the country with its capacity, insulted her by its manners, exhausted her by its rapacity, and slandered her by its malice," and is now, a century afterwards, established, (as far as England can), in the Cabinet, on the Wool-sack, on the bench. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la mène chose.*

ters." "Yet neither my uncle or his son ever fought in the ranks of the insurgents, nor left their houses—unluckily for them! Had they followed the people's camp they might have escaped the cruel end of being put to death in the presence of all that were dear to them."

The *Dublin Evening Post*, September 24, 1796, writes of a paper in pay of the Castle, wherein "the blind fury of the banditti which usurps and disgraces the name of *Orange* in the North,<sup>4</sup> is appended, and all their bloody excesses justified. Murder in all its horrid forms, assassinations in cold blood, the mutilation of members without respect to age or sex, the firing of whole hamlets, . . . the atrocious excursions of furious hordes, armed with sword, fire and faggot, to exterminate a people for presuming to obey the divine command, 'Honor thy father and thy mother' . . . and for walking in the religion which seemed good in their eyes." "Indeed the settled practice was," as Hay saw, "to shoot all men that were met; and of this desperate system, the most innocent and peaceable were generally the most likely to suffer. They were unwilling to join the insurgents; and the ungenerous suspicions generally thrown out, however unjustly, against the Catholics . . . precluded the possibility of their joining the army or yeomen, who professed the rankest and most inveterate distrust of the people, for any of whom it was extremely unsafe to venture into their presence on any occasion whatsoever, as numbers had fallen a sacrifice to a confidence in their own peaceable intentions and innocent demeanor; and this kind of conduct had finally the effect of determining multitudes to join the insurgents, considering it, at length, the only means of self-preservation."

"The mind of the impartial reader must be strongly impressed with this barbarous impolicy . . . as well as with the desperate situation in which the country was placed through these means." ("History of the Irish Rebellion," p. 121.)

"The North Cork regiment were the introducers of pitch-cap torture into the County of Wexford. . . . A serjeant (*sic.*) nicknamed Tom the Devil was most ingenious in devising new modes of torture. Moistened gunpowder was frequently rubbed into the hair cut close, and then set on fire; . . . often both ears were completely cut off, in this 'shearing.' . . . These atrocities were publicly practiced without the least reserve in open day, and no magistrate or officer ever interfered, but shamefully connived at this extraordinary mode of quieting the people!" (Hay, p. 57.) "Many

---

<sup>4</sup> And, of their detestable controversial preachers, even now, the saner Protestant incumbent of St. Augustine's, Derry, Mr. Cowan, maintains, that "All they ask for is, like Sir Samuel Ferguson's 'Loyal Orangeman,'

"The crown of the causeway in road and street,  
And the rebelly Papishes under my feet.'"

magistrates of Wexford made themselves conspicuous in practicing the summary mode of quieting the country, by the infliction of all kinds of torture. . . . They seemed to have rivaled the conduct of the magistrates of other counties, who had made trial of the *salutary* effects of persecution somewhat sooner." (p. 60.) "The rising of the people in the county of Wexford took place, . . . for fear, as they alleged, of being whipped, burned or exterminated by the Orangemen, hearing of the numbers that were put to death, unarmed and unoffending," in "deliberate massacre." . . . "Strange to tell, officers presided to sanction these proceedings." In Goldwin Smith's words on the oligarchy and the ascendancy: "They were the authors, before God, of the rebellion, though the people died for it by earthly law."

The driving to rebellion of individuals is noteworthy:

"The Rev. Michael Murphy's altar had been torn up, his chapel windows broken, and the building despoiled, by yeomen uttering the most violent threats against the priest and his flock," and "these depredations induced him to alter his original intentions and not fly to such people for protection." "He and the Rev. John Murphy had been remarkable for their exhortations and exertions against the system of United Irishmen, until they were thus whirled into this *political vortex*, which, from all the information I have been able to collect, they undertook under the apprehension of extermination." (p. 80.) "Mr. Bagenal Harvey—liberal Protestant—had collected the arms of all his tenantry and neighborhood, and brought them into Wexford. As it was late when he delivered them up, he did not return home that night, but remained in town; and just as he was going to bed, he was arrested by Captain Boyd, and lodged in the gaol." (p. 74.) After the rebellion, "Mr. Bagenal Harvey had gone to his residence at Bargo Castle, having no conception that the terms agreed upon with Lord Kingsborough would not be ratified." ("Remember Limerick!")<sup>5</sup> At his trial in Wexford, "it was proved

<sup>5</sup> The battle-cry of the Irish Brigade in the service of France: *cúimnízid an luimneic azar feall na saffanac*—and how they lied to us there. "It was a tragic necessity that the Irish should remember it; but it was far more tragic that the English forgot it. For he who has forgotten his sin is repeating it incessantly forever."—G. K. Chesterton's "Short History of England," treating of Limerick as "the city of violated treaty."

But, indeed, none so blind as those who will not see. And how successful has English gold and hypocrisy been in keeping others from seeing. As but yesterday, for the so-called "Irish" convention, nominated by England, and kept going to hoodwink America when no help was needed, or to-day when a mock German plot is got up to make America hate Ireland, and to-morrow, probably, when a new Home Rule bill will be passed to show how generous England is, and so keep Ireland and sympathizers quiet, until the world is settled, and England is stronger than ever to deal with her small-nation neighbors alone—so in John Moore's day, the good Abbe Edgworth, *ouis XVI's* confessor, writes to the conservative-minded Bishop Moylan, of Cork, on England's "wise and firm government" in Ireland. Surely, England could then, as with her censorship now, see that no cry of Ireland would be heard out in the world, or her true condition be known. Abbe Edgworth never heard of Lord Gosford's Armagh.



that he was forced to join the insurgents; but he and the rest were hanged, their heads stuck on pikes, and their bodies stripped and treated with the most brutal indecencies, before being cast over the bridge." (p. 208.)

Dr. Madden, the Imperialist historian of the United Irishmen, the men with whom Sir John Moore and Sir Ralph Abercromby were called on to deal, published documents of 1797, such as this, in substance: A Mr. Potter, Enniskillen farmer, charged with being a United Irishman—the soldiers demanded from his wife that her husband (who was from home) should surrender in three hours, or they would burn her house. They burnt it. Mrs. Potter, with seven children, one not a month old, were turned out to the fields, at midnight. A Mr. Bernard Crossan's house was attacked by Orangemen, for that he was a *reputed* Catholic. His son prevented their entrance by the front door. At the back they entered, and shot father, son and daughter.

It is just such a doing as the murdered Sheehy Skeffington wove into his story of the harrying of Wexford into the 1798 rebellion—in "Dark and Evil Days."<sup>6</sup> In this latter author's own day—and especially since—the trampling and driving, or the goading, has shown another face—of shameless partiality, followed by unmeant bluster, a face of vulgar bluff, of pretense and of cunning procrastination, of shaming Ireland once more throughout the world, by neglect, by defamation; a face of hoaxes and humbug, and promises for eye and ear—persuading to suspicion, to mistrust, to anger, to a knowledge pressed into the Irish of the seemingly ineradicable hypocrisy that is in their conqueror. To which persuadings, if a people's common-sense and self-respect were not to yield, then it would indeed be a people quite hopeless, for this our day at least.

"Struck to the heart with spite and sharp despair  
Through proof late made of English faith."<sup>7</sup>

Again of Wexford, in 1798 itself, Miles Byrne tells such tales as the following: "Garrett Fennell, who had just landed from England, and was on his way to see his father and family, was . . . tied by his two hands up to a tree; Hunter Gowan's 'black mob' then lodged the contents of their carbines in the body of poor Fennell, at their captain's command . . . Fennell left a young widow and two children. This cruel deed took place on the road between our house and the chapel. The day after, about three miles from our place . . . twenty-eight fathers of families, prisoners, were . . . massacred in the ball alley of Carnew, without trial. I knew

<sup>6</sup> Duffy & Co.: Dublin, 1916.

<sup>7</sup> Swinburne's "Bothwell": II, 3.

several of the murdered men." This was the Hunter Gowan patronized by the Government, who asked a neighbor's wife to show him her sick husband's room, and shot this Catholic neighbor dead with: "Now you will be saved the trouble of nursing your damned Popish husband."

And so, by contrast, Miles Byrne comes to Sir John Moore, when writing, in words applicable generally: "Alas, William Byrne was soon cruelly undeceived and taught that no reliance could be placed on the protection granted by any of the English tyrants then ruling over unhappy Ireland." He is alluding to William Byrne's sudden trial and execution at Wicklow after his going to Dublin to join his sisters, under a safe conduct from the general-in-chief of the English forces. Byrne had been able to protect Orange prisoners, and so must have had influence among rebels! He saved several prisoners charged with "persecuting" the people; among them Thomas Dowse, with whom he was intimate. "Could it be believed that Dowse's evidence, on Byrne's trial . . . in which he (Dowse) declared his heartfelt gratitude, he said that to Byrne alone he owed his life, was the principal one on which the unfortunate Byrne was found guilty and executed? . . . Every one knew him and loved him and respected him in his neighborhood. . . . It was not extraordinary that he could save persons (there), against whom no very serious crimes were proved; still, this humane act sufficed with the cruel Ascendancy men."

The Protestant clergyman Gordon, in his history of all this—p. 458—even generalizes, after noting that the result of Cornwallis' Amnesty, except for leaders and homicides out of battle, was that "no means of conviction were neglected." "Strange as it may seem, acts of humanity were considered as proof of guilt. Whoever could be proved to have saved a loyalist from assassination, his house from burning, or his property from plunder, was pronounced to have had influence among the rebels, consequently a rebel commander." "The most convincing testimony," remarks Dr. Sigerson—"Last Independent Parliament of Ireland,"<sup>8</sup> p. 134—"was delivered at their trials, in order to hang them by those whom they had saved."

Miles Byrne continues, by contrast, as to the victim Byrne's elder brother, Garrett, that he, "a real and distinguished chief all through the insurrection," had surrendered some time before, to Sir John Moore, on condition of being allowed to quit the country and expatriate himself forever," and Miles Byrne reflects: "What a pity that William Byrne had not to do with a man like Sir John Moore, who

---

<sup>8</sup> Dublin, Gill & Co., 1918.

valued his own word of honor and his reputation, pledged to Garrett Byrne, more than any flattery or reward he could obtain from the Castle Inquisitors." Garrett Byrne "escaped, because he applied to a man of honor and high reputation, General Sir John Moore, and not to Lake, or to that old hypocrite, Lord Cornwallis."

Cornwallis' wish (!) was to "avoid all this dirty business"; nothing preventing peace, so he said, but "the ferocity of the loyalists," whom he calls "the most corrupt people under heaven," and of whom he remained in fact, the accomplice, when by them, as he says, any man "in a brown coat was butchered, though miles from the field of action." In Lord Cornwallis' words as Lord Lieutenant, from Dublin Castle, July 24, 1798 (to General Ross) after saying: "There is no law either in town or country but martial law and you know enough of that to see all the horrors of it," then: "But all this is trifling compared to the numberless murders that are hourly committed by our people without any process or examination whatever. The Yeomanry are in the style of the Loyalists in America, only much more numerous and powerful and a thousand times more ferocious. These men have saved the country, but they now take the lead in rapine and murder. The Irish militia, with few officers, and those chiefly of the worst kind, follow closely on the heels of the Yeomanry in murder and every kind of atrocity. . . . The feeble outrages, burnings and murders which are still committed by the rebels serve to keep up the sanguinary disposition on our side. . . . The conversation of the principal persons of the county . . . always turns on hanging, shooting, burning, etc., etc."<sup>9</sup>

As to this governor for the Irish, Lady Louise Connolly, aunt of Lord Edward, had written—perhaps, once more, with the credulous optimists of her country—on July 10, 1798: "Lord Cornwallis' coming at first raised me—his character has always been so good . . . But, alas! I hear that our Cabinet are all against him—what can he do? And yet, if he leaves us, I am afraid we are undone. It is astonishing to see the veneration his name creates. . . . What could be so wise as trusting to an honest man, an experienced military man, and, above all, an unprejudiced man, who cannot have imbibed any of our misguided passions?" On which Thomas Moore, in his "Memoirs of Lord Edward," has a note: "It was the opinion

<sup>9</sup> "If only we could make them rise again, and then we'd exterminate them," said the British officers at a County Cork dinner table, after 1916. "Then we could conquer the whole island again," said another fighter for the rights of small nations. "Plant the whole place with Protestants from Britain," writes a County Cork parson, in his press. "Would that the Irish had all died of hunger in the famine," exclaims in 1919 a Protestant Irish savage, to our shamed and indignant co-religionist, an Irish Volunteer. Such men of such minds still live. Their hostile mind continues. The manners change only when they must.



of Sir John Moore, of whose sincere love of liberty no one can doubt, that if ever there was a case in which the employment of such an officer as Dictator could be desired, it was that of the State of Ireland—one honest, strong and uncompromising hand being alone adequate, in his opinion, to the application of such remedies as she requires."

Cornwallis, whatever he was, saw that "the violence of our friends [the Protestant Ascendancy] and their folly in endeavoring to make it a religious war, added to the ferocity of our troops, who delight in murder, most powerfully counteract all plans of conciliation." Our friends' "conversation and conduct point to no other mode of concluding this unhappy business than that of extirpation."<sup>10</sup>

Sir John Moore, while on duty in Ireland, wrote, during the rebellion (with somewhat the same spirit as Sir Francis Vane<sup>11</sup> in our own day):

"The mode which has been followed to quiet the disturbances in this country has been to proclaim the districts in which the people appear to be most violent, and to let loose the military, who were encouraged in acts of great violence against all who were supposed to be disaffected. By these means the disturbances have been quelled, an apparent calm produced, but the disaffection has been undoubtedly increased. The gentlemen in general, however, still call aloud for violent measures as the most proper to be adopted, and a complete line seems to be drawn between the upper and lower orders."

<sup>10</sup> "The prevalent mode of suppressing insurrection, namely violation, flagellation, conflagration, deliberate murder and extermination" (Hay's "Irish Rebellion," p. 144).

<sup>11</sup> "The rebellion (1916) was a chivalrous effort to maintain . . . national tradition. . . . The rebellion, foolish or criminal, or what not, was outdistanced and outclassed by the extreme idiocy and brutality of its suppression. . . . A well-known fool general who arrived when it was all over but the shouting—and the killing—was given plenary powers. . . . It was Pearse's, MacDonagh's and Connolly's wish, by offering their lives, to prove to the Irish people that the British Government had not changed since '98, and to show them that the British people were still as easily deceived by their pastors and masters as they were in respect to the events of '47-48. These Irish leaders did not die in vain, they achieved the aim of their sacrifice. To the Irish people to-day the British Government appears as incredibly stupid and as brutally callous as their grandfathers believed them a hundred years ago." (Sir Francis Vane, in the "New Witness," edited by G. K. Chesterton, June 21, 1918.)

We read in the life of Haliday, author of the "Scandinavian History of Dublin," how his father told that Judge Sandys would say to Surgeon Lentaigue (French Royalist emigre), who had put on Wolf Tone's self-wounded neck the bandages torn off it by Tone, lying between life and death: "Lentaigue, I will hang your patient to-morrow morning; his neck is well enough for the rope." And Lentaigue: "No, no, you must not stir him. By Gar, if you do I will not be answerable for his life." Grim jokes, adds the biographer, that best bespeak the violent passions prevalent in that period of blood and terror. That period! And James Connolly's 1916 death-doing, wounded, bandaged, propped up to be shot sitting, for he could not stand. It takes such things, one period after another, to undeceive the credulous Irish, too ready to forgive and forget, while "the sword that never spared to strike is sheathed but for sharper use, and England remembers, and when herself, will never forget. *Crede expertis.*

What callings aloud have not been heard from that day to this! "What do men call vigor?"—so wrote "Peter Plymley" a few years later than that rebellion—"to let loose hussars and to bring up artillery, to govern with lighted matches, and to cut and push and prime. I call this not vigor, but the *sloth of cruelty and ignorance*." "How awfully would I pause before I sent forth the flame and the sword over the . . . brave, generous, open-hearted peasants of Ireland! How easy it is to shed human blood; how easy it is to persuade ourselves that it is our duty to do so, and that the decision has cost us a severe struggle; how much in all ages have wounds and shrieks and tears been the cheap and vulgar resources of the rulers of mankind; how difficult and how noble it is to govern with kindness and to found an empire upon the everlasting basis of justice and affection!" "Depend upon it, whole nations have always some reason for their hatred." "But, as I have before said," so this English parson (*in propria persona*, Sydney Smith), assured us, "the moment the very name of Ireland is mentioned, the English seem to bid adieu to common feeling, common prudence and common sense, and to act with the barbarity of tyrants and the fatuity of idiots."<sup>11</sup> "If I were an Irishman," Sydney Smith goes on to quote Sir John Moore's saying to Grattan, as cited below, "I should be a rebel." That impatient Englishman, John Henry Newman, echoed his words, and they are said to have been echoed to our own day by John Richard Green, historian of the English people.

Even the late Professor Gordon—Irishman, but as he liked to say, Anglo-Irish, imperial, cosmopolitan—finding out (through having to do with the Englishman-in-Ireland, Shelley), "about Grattan, Curran, Wolfe Tone, Robert Emmet, Napper Tandy, and other heroes," "a most fascinating piece of history," may well have added seriously: "And I thank my stars that I have been born out of due season; for, as sure as I sit here, a literary epicurean, I should have been by Wolfe Tone's side in those days."

Of the rebellion and its chances of success, Thomas Moore notes

<sup>11</sup> To an Englishman writing in 1918: "Englishmen seem to become devils in Ireland, corrupted by the poison of imperialism." To Ireland, 1882, another wrote:

"Thy hands may stretch to a kindred world; there is none that hates but one;

And she but hates as a pretext for the rapine she has done."

All through the long days of plunder and scorn and trampling on feelings and hopes, what were that England's English here, in each coming band of fortune-makers, but

"A people strong and dreadful to behold,  
Stern to the young, remorseless to the old.  
Masters whose speech thou canst not understand,  
By cruel signs shall give the harsh command:  
Doubtful of life shalt thou by night, by day,  
For grief, and dread, and trouble pine away;  
Thy evening wish—Would God! I saw the sun;  
Thy morning sigh—Would God! the day were done."

that . . . "even mutilated as it was of native strength, and unassisted from without, the rebellion yet presented so formidable a front as to incline Sir John Moore to the opinion that had a French force, at the same time, shown itself on the coast, the most serious, if not fatal consequences must have ensued."

One of the scenes which he saw, this English general describes:

" . . . found a great stir in Clogheen, a man tied up and being flogged; the sides of the streets filled with country people on their knees and their hats off,"<sup>12</sup> recalling to us some London Irish praying in the street near Roger Casement's jail at his death-doing.

"The High-Sheriff, Mr. Fitzgerald, was, we were told, making great discoveries. He had already flogged truth out of several respectable persons, who had confessed themselves to be generals, colonels, captains, etc., of the rebels. The rule was to flog<sup>13</sup> each person till he told the truth and gave the names of other rebels. These were then sent for and underwent a similar operation. . . . The number flogged was considerable. It lasted all the forenoon."

Another History of the Rebellion, already quoted, that by Gordon, Protestant clergyman and loyalist, has these words: "A small occurrence . . . of which a son of mine was witness may help to illustrate the state of the country at that time: Two yeomen coming to a brake or clump of bushes, and observing a small motion as if some persons were hiding there, one of them fired into it, and the shot was answered by a most piteous and loud screech of a child. The other yeoman was then urged by his companion to fire; but he being a gentleman, and less ferocious, instead of firing, commanded the concealed persons to appear, when a poor woman and eight children almost naked, one of whom was severely wounded,

---

<sup>12</sup> In that eighteenth century, two touring Englishmen noted that "the Roman Catholics make no scruple to assemble in the open fields. As we passed yesterday a by-road we saw a priest under a tree, with a large assembly about him, celebrating Mass." "In all Donegal, for sixty miles west and south, they celebrate in the open air, in the fields or on the mountains," wrote the Established Bishop Pococke, at the same time as those tourists, who remarked: "These sort of people, my lord, seem to be very solemn and sincere in their devotions." In the days of Sir John Moore, there was a Protestant Bishop of Elphin found to write: "By far the greatest part of the population of my diocese are Roman Catholics. I know I cannot make them good Protestants; I therefore wish to make good Catholics of them; and, with this intention, I put into their hands the works of Gother, an eminent Catholic divine." He adds that "speculating differences in some points of faith were of no account. His Roman Catholic brethren and himself had but one religion, the religion of Christians—and that without justice to the Catholics, there could be no security for the Protestant establishment." ("Catholic Question," *Edin. Rev.*, Nov., 1810.)

<sup>13</sup> Lord Cornwallis (succeeding the Marquis of Camden, 1798): "On my arrival in the country, I put a stop to the burning of houses and murder of the inhabitants by the yeomen or any other persons who delighted in that amusement; to the flogging for the purpose of extorting confession, and to the free quarters, which comprehend universal rape and robbery throughout the whole country."



came trembling from the brake, where they had secreted themselves for safety.<sup>14</sup>

An Englishman, as "an old officer of cavalry" wrote in the *London Globe*, October 19, 1839 (indignant at the injustice of some Irish clergymen touring in England and abusing Ireland and the Irish), of what he had seen in Ireland, 1796, in Lord Gosford's Armagh, as alluded to above: "There I remained several months, and during that period I had witnessed the excesses committed by the Orange party (who now began to form themselves into lodges), and the dreadful persecutions to which the Catholic inhabitants were subjected. Night after night I have seen the sackings and burnings of the dwellings of these poor people . . . I may mention one of these dreadful scenes, of which I was myself an eye-witness, during our nightly patrol. We had already reached a heap of burning ruins, when a shot was heard apparently about a quarter of a mile from the fire. On proceeding to the spot we discovered a dying man whom the miscreants had shot, in his house, in their retreat from the fire. They had fired through the window into the room where the man was sitting with his family. The poor fellow died a few minutes after our arrival.

"It is impossible for me to describe, at this distance of time, the horrors and atrocities I witnessed during that period." (Quoted in Grattan's "Memoirs," IV., p. 235-7.)

Of a yeomanry relative of the Grattan's, we are told by Grattan's son ("Memoirs," Vol. IV., p. 392), that after yeomen had been shooting country people at sight, and after "three men of his corps had ill-used" a woman in the neighborhood, this "independent, humane" man (brother of Mrs. Tighe, the poetess) complained, in very strong terms to the captain. "The reply he got was remarkable: 'The crime is great, but consider the times, my dear sir—it would be dangerous to punish the yeomanry.'" This was the error throughout. However, a remarkable opinion, very different from this, and worthy of being recorded was given shortly after by high and unquestionable authority—this brilliant and ever to be lamented General Sir John Moore. He was at this period serving in Ireland, and in the report which he then gave to the Lord Lieutenant on the county of Wicklow, and on the quiet state to which he had brought

<sup>14</sup> It is the story told, generations after, of an American lieutenant, who indeed finished off all his Indian women and children. Nor, as the late Protestant Episcopal Bishop Whipple noted (v. H. Jackson's "A Century of Dishonor," of U. S. dealings with Indians), did he and his men, though well known, meet any justice. Caroline Murat, in her memoirs, tells of a Suffolk country house party, with handsome and painted men, proteges of Edward VII., then Prince of Wales: "Percy Barker, who was never sober, but a kind, good-hearted fellow; and Captain Powell, who had been through the Indian Mutiny and told funny stories of shooting into moving bushes and old women rolling out. How strange their talk, their manners, their ideas, all seemed to me, fresh from the Court of the Tuilleries."

it toward the end of the year, adds, 'That the presence of troops may be necessary for some time longer, but it would be more to check the yeomanry and the Protestants than the people.' " "Such effects did these scenes produce on the mind of Sir John Moore that in a conversation he had upon the subject with Mr. Grattan, he said, '*If I were an Irishman, I should be a rebel.*' "

Lecky, in his "England in the Eighteenth Century," ch. xxix., as to Moore, when near Wexford, gives his tribute, while telling that "Moore's troops, like all who were employed in Wexford, were in a state of wild undiscipline, and in spite of the utmost efforts of the brave and humane commander, they had committed numerous outrages on their march. . . .

"If Moore, or any other general of ability, humanity, and tact, had held the supreme command in Wexford, the rebellion would probably have at once terminated. But now, as ever, Lake acted with a brutal, stupid, and indiscriminating severity, that was admirably calculated to intensify and to prolong the conflagration."

But in 1918, an Ulster descended English officer and author writes that he "would rather have to do with knaves than fools; because though a knave will always act wrongly, yet he will act with consistency, and you can count him; while a fool acts anyhow, and you cannot. I have often said that M——, of 1916, was an incarnate example of the vulgar expression, 'a —— fool! He was bloody because of the conceit of extreme ignorance.' Before the day of Vinegar Hill, a general burning of houses and lands over Wexford is told of as marking the passage of the English army; the people fled to Wexford, and "described in melancholy strain of lamentation, how they themselves had narrowly escaped with life from the fury of the soldiery . . . encouraged to range and ravage the country." But Hay, eye-witness thereof, adds: "I must, however, observe that General Moore did all in his power to prevent these atrocities, and got some plunderers immediately put to death. . . . Did Ireland enjoy the blessings of such rulers, it would never have been involved in such a dreadful situation." (p. 172.)

Lecky then proceeds to examples of the un-Moore-like 'Lake-ism' of that day, or 'Bowen-Colthurst-ism' of this:

"Father Philip Roche, perceiving the rebellion to be hopeless, desired to negotiate for his troops on the Three Rocks a capitulation like that of the rebels at Wexford; and in order to do so, he boldly came down alone and unarmed. On his way he was seized, dragged off his horse, so kicked and buffeted, that he was said to have been scarcely recognizable, then tried by court-martial and hanked off

Wexford Bridge. He met his fate with a dogged, defiant courage, declaring that the insurgents in Wexford had been deceived, that they had expected a general insurrection through Ireland, and that if the other counties had done their duty, they would have succeeded. . . . The result of his arrest (*sic*) was that the main body of rebels on the Three Rocks, under the command of another priest, at once marched towards the county of Carlow, to add one more bloody page to the rebellion."

"But at my table" (says Lord Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant), "If a priest has been put to death, the greatest joy is expressed by the whole company."

"Another victim was Matthew Keugh, the rebel Governor of Wexford . . . tried by court-martial and sentenced to death. Musgrave"—the painstaking but violently anti-Irish historian of the rebellion; as Lecky here declares him to be—"has noticed the eminent dignity, eloquence and pathos of his defense, and his unalterable courage in the face of death." Some English military leaders "proved that he had acted on all occasions with singular humanity, that he had uniformly endeavored to prevent the effusion of blood, and that they owed their lives to his active interference. . . . But Lake was determined to show his firmness. Keugh was hanged off Wexford Bridge; his head was severed from his body, and fixed on a pike before the court-house in Wexford, while his body was thrown into the river."

Fit for "Hottentots"—or, as the mother of the Napiers was then writing, with scorn for the scorners: "What matter, for rascally rebels?" Yet "for his country he died." A small country. This nationality is a smaller one now. However, of course, in this our happier day, there is to be no difference made between small and great. Mauryah! We conquered the Irish, says Dr. Johnson's other English-ism. Good. Treat them as conquered. Good. Treat them as rebels. Bad, he says: "monstrous injustice"—to quote Johnson's judgment.

"Marble's not so hard as Spite  
Armed with lawless strength and Might."

"In a strictly legal point of view," Lecky goes on to theorize, "the position of Lake was no doubt unassailable." That would be weighed. What is Law? What are laws? What is absolute in law? Is Might Right? Is there a Right? Does Force bind Conscience?

General Lake had not been reading Burke: "To the solid establishment of every law two things are essentially requisite; first, a proper and sufficiently human power to declare and modify the



matter of the law; and next, such a fit and equitable constitution as they have a right to declare and render binding." "Law and arbitrary power are in eternal enmity . . . We are all born in subjection—all born equally, high and low, governor and governed, in subjection to one great immutable, pre-existent law, prior to all our devices and prior to all our contrivances, paramount to all our ideas and all our sensations, antecedent to our very existence. . . . If all dominion of man over man is the effect of the Divine disposition, it is bound by the eternal laws of Him that gave it."

That is not the faith of the modern English authority, Austin, who in "Lectures in Jurisprudence," i., 221, gives no chance to liberty in small or in great: "To say that human laws which conflict with the Divine law are not binding . . . is stark nonsense."<sup>15</sup> Now, a few foolish years ago we were being bawled at, that that was "Prussianism" only; we, whose civilization—and Canon William Barry, out of his England, bids us always remember it—is Christian and Catholic; we heirs of mediæval liberty of conscience, wherein, as Otto Gierke puts it ("Political Theories of the Middle Ages," p. 82; Cambridge, 1900), "every individual by virtue of his eternal destination is at the core somewhat holy and indestructible; the smallest part has a value of its own, and not merely because it is a part of a whole." Indeed, says Maitland ("Constitutional History," p. 101): "Our modern theories run counter to the deepest convictions of the Middle Ages." When men think of "pre-existent law," when neither Church nor State derives its authority from the other; then, "obviously, when men think thus, while they more or less consistently act upon this theory, they have no sovereign in Austin's sense; before the Reformation Austin's doctrine was impossible."

Unluckily for Ireland, her part of history which "maist ruin'd a'" has been enacted since that moral catastrophe.<sup>16</sup> But, just as Lincoln felt, that "If slavery is not wrong, then nothing is wrong; there never was a time that I did not feel like this," so the Irish feeling has been, through multitudes, in generations unbroken, that they resisted, strove, fought, that they fled, that they submitted, under force and in fear—with the sense of right on their side, of right against might, of justice in plotting against invader's plunder-

<sup>15</sup> What the Christian Syllabus, under Pius IX. condemned was that "the violating of most sacred laws, and the doing of criminal and wicked acts, opposed to Eternal Law, is not only blameless, but is perfectly lawful and most praiseworthy, if inspired by love of one's mother country."

<sup>16</sup> "Les abus amènent les révolutions; mais les abus valent mieux que les révolutions."

ing, of loyalty to something their own, in clanship, in leadership, or in nationhood,<sup>17</sup> with the sense of the wild justice in revenge.

"And we prove our right by a nation's fight outliving a thousand years."

And inarticulately, or expressed, the homage is to

the Law that is above the law

And justifies the hearts of men.

"No man, no class of men, can respect a law which places them outside itself," is the voice to-day of a defender of the Irish, who, while in exile, is unwearied, we believe, doing her good—Monsignor O'Riordan—preaching on "The Merit of Martyrdom"—St. Patrick's Day, Rome, 1916; his subject-matter, certain laws of men, so-called—the Penal Laws. But "Law is made to protect a people; and when it tries to suppress them instead, it expresses rather the wilfulness of a tyrant than the will of a legislator: it is what St. Thomas called it: 'not law, but iniquity'— . . . *opportet quòd sit aliqua ratione regulata*; . . . *alioquin magis esset iniquitas quàm lex*—Outlaw a man or a class of men, for following their conscience, and you at once set their conscience against the law."

"Law was design'd to keep a state in peace;

. . . . . a constant fort,

To which the weak and injured might resort;

But these perverted minds its force employ,

Not to protect mankind, but to annoy."

Under Sir Ralph Abercromby (that other Scotsman, who also met his death in battle), Sir John Moore afterwards served, in Egypt—Abercromby, who was turned away from being commander-in-chief in Ireland because of his unwillingness to act with the old English "vigour." "The bravery, good sense and humanity of Sir Ralph Abercromby were all misplaced in that wretched warfare in Ireland, where the soldier was sent to *make*, not to meet enemies, and the lash and the picket went before, to cater for the bayonet. The army, which could hardly burn, shoot, stab and violate fast enough for its patrons and admirers, was by him branded with a public and

<sup>17</sup> "It stands to reason that form of government into which a nation has educated itself must be the expression of the national spirit and genius of that nation; supposing always that the nation has had a free development, has not been tyrannized over and brutalized by the dominion of another far greater than itself. We might almost say that where this has been so, the result has brought out the weakness as well as the strength of the particular national spirit. Take Ireland for instance, where the national genius has been, as it says, oppressed by centuries of English tyranny, by a little over-nursing and the misrule, the Irish spirit is unassimilated; it is not certainly what it would have been had it been left alone. Foreign dominion has been one very influential factor in its history; it has brought out its bad points most certainly, and it has not less certainly, if we would take pains to investigate it, brought out the good." (Bishop Stubbs, of Oxford.)

indignant rebuke for its licentiousness, and pronounced to be 'in a state which made it formidable to every one but the enemy.' (Feb. 26, 1798.)" Abercromby wrote out of the Ireland of 1798: "Every crime, every cruelty that could be committed by Cossacks and Calmucks has been transacted here." That is, Irishmen at least need be under no obligation to keep up the pretense implied there, that such crimes must be less characteristic of English troops than of Russian.

If Abercromby had had his chance in Ireland? If Sir John Moore?

Warriors

"More able to endure,  
As more exposed to suffering and distress;  
Thence, also, more alive to tenderness."

They had thoughts that pitied men. They could feel at one with their kind. They could see that their enemies in the field, the United Irishmen, were aiming at union among the people of their country; and that the faction was aiming at unending bullying or strife, at plundering, at oppression. Had they known more of what was moving the souls of Irishmen, bitter only when hated and scorned, and looking for the day when, at peace in their own land,<sup>18</sup> they might feel at peace with all the world, then these nobler soldiers might have but sympathized and understood, even more, and better. And, perhaps, such men, from what they saw, knew more than they ever said.

A further word from Miles Byrne reveals the soul of the oppressed people, their courage in hope, their self-knowledge, self-respect, self-control; as in the days when Thomas Davis<sup>19</sup> (1814-

<sup>18</sup> Looking for the day that never came. As when in the first age of their torments for religion's sake, their Archbishop of Cashel wrote to Pope and Spain, recalling fidelity of the Irish to the Holy See for a thousand years and more, and, now, "that for fifty years they have been very often sorely provoked, molested, and afflicted by divers schisms, errors and heresies of the unstable and restless sect and nation of the kingdom of England"—then resting under the ex-Catholic Elizabeth, as lately under her Catholic sister, or her Protestant brother, or her Pope-King father. Ireland, "in extent, in its temperate climate, in its fertility, and in its wealth, might well vie with the kingdom of England, if only it were ruled justly and piously by a religious resident Catholic Prince." All the states of Ireland "detest the tyrannous and inconstant yoke of the English State, and still more its heresies, with which they desire to have nothing in common, except neighborliness and Christian love."

<sup>19</sup> "But my trust is strong in God, who made us brothers,  
That He will not suffer those right hands  
Which thou hast joined in holier rites than wedlock  
To draw opposing brands.  
Oh, many a tuneful tongue that thou mad'st vocal  
Would lie cold and silent then;  
And songless long once more, should often-widowed Erin  
Mourn the loss of her brave young men.



1845), gave hope; as now in these days of life through death, when the annual Conference of the Irish Temperance League in Belfast (Jan. 28, 1918), hears how "Sinn Feiners are desperately strong for temperance: if one of standing among them was found under the influence of drink, he would be dismissed immediately."

And the Bishop of Cork (Dr. Cohalan) at the annual meeting of the Cork Young Men's Society (Feb. 10, 1918), said he had heard "praise of the younger generation for their extraordinary temperance, or sobriety. That was becoming obvious to everybody. It commenced perhaps with the confirmation pledges, but it no doubt received very great support from the great Gaelic movement, which is reviving everything worth reviving in the old Gaelic civilization. With that movement there grew up sentiments of self-respect—determination in the Irishman to respect himself and eliminate from the Irish character every blot or stain on the standard of Ireland. The temperance movement was advanced by that; and I think it was brought to its present perfection—disciplined perfection (and credit should be given to them, whatever persons may say about politics)—by the men of the Volunteer or Sinn Fein movement. They must be largely given credit for the perfecting in the development of the spirit of sobriety in the young men of the country. The effect of the movement on temperance was remarkable, greater than perhaps a mission, for the effects of a mission are largely produced by the enthusiasm of the moment, and though they were permanent in a great number of cases, in other cases they were not. But the recent movement—just like a real military movement—has brought into the minds of the young generation, that while it is an honorable thing for a man to be able to plough or mow well, it is not to his credit or honor to be able to drink so many pints."

Byrne speaks of the good effects of the "Irish Volunteers" of those days, the United Irishmen. "It gave the first alarm to the Government; they suspected something extraordinary was going on; finding that disputes, fighting at fairs and other places of public meeting had completely ceased. . . . Drunkenness ceased also. For an United Irishman to be found *drunk* was unknown for many months. . . . Such was the sanctity of our cause."

Enemies of the United Irishmen found them to be miscreants,

---

"Oh, brave young men, my love, my pride, my promise,  
 'Tis on you my hopes are set,  
 In manliness, in kindliness, in justice,  
 To make Erin a nation yet:  
 Self-respecting, self-relying, self-advancing,  
 In union or in severance, free and strong—  
 And if God grant this, then, under God, to Thomas Davis  
 Let the greater praise belong."  
 —Sir Samuel Ferguson: "Lament for Thomas Davis."

because they were guilty of "treason"; but they vindicated them from encouraging to crimes other than this.

Their generous enemy, whom this their panegyrist admired, had, in his own death, the like praise, under the historian Napier's parting word that "Sor John Moore" had "a disinterested patriotism more in keeping with the primitive than the luxurious age of a great nation"; he was "a stern enemy to vice" . . . a just and faithful servant of his country." "While he lived, he did not shun, but scorned and spurned the base; and . . . they spurned at him when he was dead."

W. F. G. STOCKLEY.

Cork, Ireland.

## Book Reviews

---

"Concilium Tridentinum." *Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum Nova Collectio.* Edidit Societas Goerresiana promovendis inter Germanos Catholicos Litterarum Studiis.

Tomus VIII.: Concilii Tridentini Actorum Pars quinta. Complectens acta ad praeparandum Concilium, et sessiones anni 1562 a prima (XVII.) ad sextam (XXII.). Collegit edidit illustravit Stephanus Ehses; quarto. (XIV. u. 1024 S.).

Tomus X.: Epistularum Pars Prima, complectens Epistulas a die quinta Martii, 1545, ad Concilii translationem XI. Martii, 1547, scriptas. Collegit edidit, illustravit Godolfredus Buschbell; quarto. (LXXXVII., 996.) Friburgi et Si Ludovici: B. Herder.

The nineteenth oecumenical council was opened at Trent, December 13, 1545, and was closed at the same place, December 4, 1563. Its main object was a definitive declaration of the doctrines of the Church in answer to the heresies of Protestants; and its secondary object was the thorough reform of the inner life of the Church, by removing the numerous abuses that had developed in it.

The immediate occasion of the council was the Lutheran heresy. Luther had appealed from the Pope to a general council. The Diet of Nuremburg, in 1523, demanded a "free Christian council" on German soil, and in the next year, at the same place, a demand was made for a German national council to temporarily settle the questions in dispute, to be followed by a general council to settle them permanently. Rome at once refused the demand for a national council, but permitted the consideration of a general council.

Charles V. promptly objected to the national council, but notified Clement VII. that he thought a general council expedient, and proposed Trent as the place of meeting. From that time until the first session of the council at Trent, December 13, 1545, it was the subject of discussion, dispute, plot and counter-plot among the Christian nations of the world. Italy, France, Germany, England, Spain, entered into the discussion, each thinking of its own political interests first, and the interests of religion afterwards, or not at all. Delegations went back and forth and hither and thither with protests and representations. The time was appointed and changed on several occasions; the place was fixed and altered over and over again; rulers and Pontiffs came and went during the long protracted discussions. Paul III. had succeeded Clement VII. before the Bull went forth calling all patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops and abbots to assemble at Mantua on May 23, 1537, for a general council. On account of disputes among the civil authorities, the opening was postponed to November 1, and later again postponed until May 1, 1538, and the place changed to Venice. But when the time arrived only six Bishops were present, and another postpone-



ment was arranged until Easter, 1539, and then the meeting was prorogued indefinitely at the Pope's discretion, because the Emperor hoped to bring about religious unity by a series of conferences. But his efforts were doomed to fail, as all other efforts in the same direction had failed, preparations for the council were resumed, and the first session was opened at Trent, December 13, 1545. At the second session, on January 7, besides the three presiding legates, one Cardinal, four Archbishops, twenty-two Bishops and five generals of orders were present. This number is in striking contrast to the magnificent assembly that brought the council to a close, when two hundred and fifteen delegates and thirty proxies signed the decrees.

We have dwelt at length on the long preparation for the council, with the many disputes and changes that were incidental to it, because of the conflicting interests of those concerned, in order to bring out more strongly the importance of this volume of letters, and to call attention more forcibly to the gigantic task of the editor, who had to search the archives of all the countries that took part in the work of preparation, as well as the Vatican archives. And when we remember that the council was not brought to a close until December, 1563, nor the decrees confirmed by Pius IV. until January 26, 1564, we realize still better the importance and value of the collection. The history of the Council of Trent would be barren indeed without these letters. Previous historians who had not access to them, or only partial access, or who could not, for various reasons, reproduce them, did good work in some instances, though far from perfect, while others did very bad work. The consoling thought that must linger in the mind of any fair-minded person who examines this collection is, that the promise of Christ has not failed, that the gates of hell, *i. e.*, the powers of darkness and error, should not prevail against His Church.

As to the manner in which the editorial work has been done, it would be hard to praise it too lavishly. In the Preface the author informs us that he set out for Italy in 1898 in order to collect, edit and prepare for publication the letters pertaining to the Council of Trent that were written between 1545 and 1550. But because of various obstacles in the way the work was protracted until 1914, and then, when almost complete up to 1547, it was again postponed on account of the late war. Even now it has been published without access to the Spanish archives, and for two years only instead of five. But these are only temporary defects, for the Spanish letters will be published in a later volume, as will also the letters for the other years.

The first chapter treats of the necessity of the publication of the letters, the second contains a list of the chanceries and libraries

where the letters may be found, the third tells of the plan of the work, and the fourth presents a table of all the letters, indicating those which are quoted by Pallavicino and Massarelli. Then follows the text of the letters, over 2,500 in number, which is followed again by an appendix, and a copious index of names and things.

It is not surprising that this work is stretching out over many years. It is more surprising that it is being done so rapidly. It is a monumental history of the council of councils. The difficulties in the way are not unlike the difficulties that stood in the way of the council itself. It is a triumph worth striving for, and only a great Catholic publishing house like Herder's, and a learned association like the Goerres Society could successfully carry out such an undertaking.

It would be well for all libraries, whether public, institutional or private, to procure these volumes at once. They are invaluable, and they cannot be replaced.

We reserve Vol. VIII. for future notice.

---

"*Mediæval Medicine.*" By James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D. 12mo., pp. 216. Illustrated. London: A. and C. Black. New York: The Macmillan Co.  
 "Religion and Health." By James J. Walsh, M. D., Ph. D. 8vo., pp. 341. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

The first of these volumes is one of the Medical History Manuals which the Messrs. A. and C. M. Black have been publishing for some time. It takes the learned author back to a period already familiar to him, and to his readers through him, and introduces him to a congenial field. "Until recently," he tells us, "it has been the custom to believe that there was so little of genuine interest in anything like the scientific care of ailing human beings during these centuries (476-1453), that even a volume of this kind might seem large for the tale of it. Now we know how much these men of the Middle Ages, for so long called the Dark Ages, were interested in every phase of human progress. As a matter of fact, we have found that the history of medicine and surgery, and of the medical education of the Middle Ages, are quite as interesting as all the other phases of their accomplishments." Indeed the author found so much to his hand, that it was not a question of expansion, but of compression when he sat down to enclose his matter in this modest 12mo. The book is full of surprises, but perhaps there is no more surprising chapter than that which treats of "Medical Education for Women." From it we learn that women were given opportunities for the higher education at practically all of the Italian universities during the Middle Ages, and that they became not only students, but professors at many of these institutions. Women were encouraged to take up the study

of medicine, and at Salerno the department of women's diseases was handed over entirely to them.

Altogether a very interesting volume and necessary for the student of the Middle Ages, medical or otherwise.

In "Religion and Health" Dr. Walsh may be said to have produced a companion volume for his "Health Through Will Power." "Religion and health have much more intimate relations with each other than is generally supposed. The old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon words 'health' and 'holiness' in their etymology, revealed this relationship rather strikingly. They both came from a common root, 'hal,' or 'heel,' and hale and holy meant originally exactly the same thing, though in the course of time one came to be referred to the body and the other to the soul."

Dr. Walsh has brought out the elements of this relationship between the conditions now represented by the two words. He has shown that the practice of prayer and of sacrifices, and the observance of mortification and of fasting and abstinence, as well as of the holy days prescribed by religion have proved of great value to health. "The nervous and mental diseases of humanity as well as suicide have all increased in proportion as religious belief and practice have declined. Excesses of various kinds have meant ever so much more for the production of ill-health than has work, no matter how hard, or even the inevitable risks of existence. Calm confidence in a higher power means more for health and happiness than any other element in life."

Incidentally the truth is brought home again in a striking and convincing manner, that there is no conflict between science and religion—that is between true science and true religion, because there can be no conflict between truth and truth.

It is a common saying in later times that scientific men do not believe—have no religion. We have heard of a learned (?) professor in one of our largest universities who made this assertion before a large class recently. Our author shows by numerous authentic quotations that only the young and the partly educated find religion and science in conflict, while the greatest scientific men of the world, the really learned and experienced, not only believe, but pray and worship.

The common fallacy that the practice of religion leads to nervous diseases and insanity is shown to be a clear case of "post factum, ergo propter factum," while the length of years which falls to the lot of members of religious communities who devote much time to exercises of religion, and lead abstemious lives is the best proof that health and piety go hand in hand.

Dr. Walsh's books always contain surprises, are always thought



provoking, and are always worthy of a prominent and permanent place on the book-shelf of every man who wishes to know the truth.

---

"Dante: The Central Man of all the World." A course of lectures delivered before the student body of the New York State College for Teachers, Albany, 1919, 1920. By John F. Slattery, Ph. D. 8vo, pp. 285. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

If a justification were needed for the publication of this book, we have it aptly stated in the Preface by Dr. Finley.

"A world-literary movement will commemorate in 1921 the six hundredth anniversary of the death of the immortal Dante. That a mediævalist should call forth the homage of the twentieth century to the extent of being honored in all civilized lands and by cultured peoples, who, for the most part, do not know the language spoken by him, or who do not know the religion of him who wrote the most religious book of Christianity (?) is a marvel explainable by the fact that the Divine Comedy is a drama of the soul—the story of a struggle which every man must make to possess his own spirit against forces that would enslave it. The central interest of the poem is in the individual, who may be you or I instead of Dante, the subject of the work, and that fact exalts the personal element, and gives the spiritual value which we of modern times appreciate as well as did the thirteenth century."

"To know Dante we must know the age which produced Christianity's greatest poet," says the author, at the beginning of the first chapter on "Dante and His Time." "Other writers are not so dependent upon their times for our clear understanding of their books. Dante, to be intelligible to the modern mind, cannot be taken out of the thirteenth century." Then follows a very interesting and instructive description of the men and movements of Dante's day. This is followed by a no less interesting chapter on "Dante the Man," and then the author conducts the reader through the Inferno, the Purgatorio, and the Paradiso, with enlightening comment and entertaining quotation.

He is a very able guide indeed, for he has often made the journey before. He has consulted all the other best guides, and frequently quotes them. Incidentally, he understands Dante's religious views, sympathizes with them and brings out clearly their importance in a study of the subject.

The work will serve as an excellent text-book for the Dante student or class, and will help very much not only to make the poet better known, but to make him better understood and appreciated.

✓ "The Art of Interesting: In Theory and Practice." By Francis P. Donnelly, S. J. 12mo., pp. 321. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

"This book breaks new ground. To interest readers and listeners is absolutely necessary for speakers and writers. In conversation, in letters, in short addresses before societies, in longer speeches before larger audiences, in the paragraph of the advertiser and of the journalist as well as in their pamphlets or books, the one who talks, the one who writes, must attract attention and must hold attention; the writer and speaker must interest." The book claims to teach: How tiresomeness is relieved; how monotony is avoided by life and variety; how antagonism sharpens the dull edge of attention; how novelty may be kept from degenerating into eccentricity; how originality may be won through imitation.

The book is a collection of essays rather than a text-book for the class-room, and some of them have already been published in *The Ecclesiastical Review*, *The Catholic World* and in *America*.

In some of the chapters the author teaches from models. For instance, we have "Newman and the Academic Style," "Pardow and the Popular Style," "William Jennings Bryan and the Antagonistic Style," "Father Tab and Fancy."

Father Donnelly tells us that "the philosophy of rhetoric explained and illustrated throughout the book is the basis of his work on composition called 'Model English.'" The author is well known through his other books, and the many kind and complimentary things that were said of them may be and will be truthfully repeated. Of course there is room for difference of opinion concerning styles in preaching, and one might be tempted to think that in his zeal to teach his pupils to be interesting, the author seems to be inclined to sacrifice other desirable qualities. For instance, in holding Father Pardow up as a model popular speaker, he says of him that he was not slangy. But he was at times, and he knew it and defended it.

He not only chose pretentious titles for his sermons, but he did not always live up to them. The writer can remember a Lenten course which he gave in a prominent church on controversial subjects to which large congregations were attracted, including many non-Catholics, with quite a sprinkling of Protestant clergymen. The course was very disappointing, because the speaker did not treat his subject in a satisfactory manner. As for his sense of humor, which was supposed to relieve the severity of his retreats, there was scant evidence of it in many of them. This is said with no desire to disparage Father Pardow, but for the purpose of showing that a human model is an imperfect thing at best, and needs much polishing.

"The Paths of Goodness; Some Helpful Thoughts on Spiritual Progress."  
By Rev. Edward F. Garesche, S. J. 16mo, cloth, with frontispiece, net  
\$1.50, postage 10 cents. New York: Benziger Brothers.

It is really a volume of applied Catholicity, which brings out in a fresh, vigorous style the relation of our religion to conditions that face us in our every-day life. The author is somewhat more profuse on each subject than usual, and therefore the book is more pretentious. He tells us how to acquire skill in spiritual things, and shows us that the merit of the fight is not in winning, but in striving. He makes it clear that we possess great privileges, and shows us how to use them. By striking comparisons between spiritual things and the familiar objects of our daily life, he makes interesting many topics that are often discussed only in an abstract manner. It is a practical book, and it answers practical questions which are often urgent and sometimes puzzling. For instance, we might ask ourselves, How would we answer these questions?—What do we do for Catholics after their graduation? How are we fulfilling our tremendous mission in this country? What is our spiritual "blind spot"? What is the chief hope of the lay apostolate? Is being respectful an anachronism? These and many other topics of equally great interest are discussed in "The Paths of Goodness."

---

A Manual of the Ceremonies of Low Mass. Rev. L. Kuenzel. 8vo. New York: F. Pustet & Co.

"The seminarian during the last months of his course is, as a rule, overburdened with work. One of the principal things that occupy his attention is the Mass. Throughout his course he has given a portion of his time to the study of Liturgy, but at the end he finds it difficult to make even a partial review. What he needs is a clear, concise, though complete, statement of the rubrics of Low Mass, arranged in such a way as to enable him to retain them. To assist in filling this want is the object of the 'Manual of the Ceremonies of Low Mass.'"

The first part of the book contains the rubrics pertaining to the altar and its furnishings, the vestments, etc., and brings the priest to the altar ready for the beginning of Mass. The second part is arranged in schema form, each page being divided into four columns, the second column containing the words, the third describing the actions, and fitting them to the words—these two adjoining, while the first column gives special rubrics for Low Mass before the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, and the last column gives special rubrics for Requiem Mass. Authorities are quoted at every step and references are given. It is all very clear, and it is hard to see how even the beginner could go astray with this scheme before him.



The book can be profitably used by any priest, young or old, who wishes to try himself. It will probably surprise many experienced in all that pertains to the work of the ministry to find how time has brought about changes, unintentionally and unconsciously followed, which are not in strict conformity with the rubrics, and perhaps are serious departures from the ceremonial law.

---

"The Principal Catholic Practices." A popular explanation of the Holy Sacraments and Catholic devotions. By Rev. George T. Schmidt. 12mo, cloth, net \$1.50. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author points out the innate beauty of the ceremonial of the Church as it is used in the administration of the Sacraments in the Mass and in the principal Catholic devotions. He treats each topic at sufficient length to make his point clear, yet briefly enough to avoid becoming preachy. The solid meat of instruction is here, yet it is handled so deftly as to make delightful reading. By adopting the descriptive form of treatment and avoiding both abstract discussion and polemics he gives his book an element of interest which should make it very popular. By converts who always desire to learn of the beauties of our ceremonial, the book will be specially welcomed.

It will be no less acceptable and useful to Catholics who quickly forget what they have learned about Catholic practices and must refresh their memory. Do we really know our religion? Do we know the meaning of its ceremonies? Are we familiar with its practices? Can we answer any question about Catholic devotions? This book gives the information in a helpful, interesting manner.















PERIODICAL

70777

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE



